THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

Volume 15 September, 1933 Number 9

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

The Trades Union Congress, Fascism and War
J. R. CAMPBELL

Roosevelt's New Deal
R. PAGE ARNOT

Dialectical Materialism and Communism
L. RUDAS

Marx and Engels on the British Working-Class Movement, 1879-1895

Published at
7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

YOU CANNOT FIGHT WITHOUT WEAPONS

Now that the season of meetings, conferences and classes is getting into swing again the time is ripe to introduce the valuable material which we have published in pamphlet form.

OUR PAMPHLETS are just that material to make more comprehensible and aid in clarifying the meaning of Marxism in the struggle against the danger of Fascism and War.

It is therefore your duty to see that these munitions are on sale at the vantage points of the movement.

Don't wait! Get equipped now!

With a quantity at the rates below.

Of all Workers' Bookshops or Newsagents, or direct from the Labour Monthly Office. Charges :

HOW LENIN STUDIED MARX.

N. KRUPSKAYA.

1d. each (1½d. post free).

12 copies 9d.
50 copies 3s. 0d. (3s. 8d. post free).
100 copies 6s. 0d. (7s. 4d. post free).

MARXISM AFTER FIFTY YEARS.

R. PALME DUTT.

2d. each (2½d. post free).

12 copies 1s. 6d.
50 copies 6s. 0d. (7s. 4d. post free).
100 copies 12s. 0d. (14s. 0d. post free).

Smaller quantities if required.

---

7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 15 SEPTEMBER, 1933 NUMBER 9

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

The Trades Union Congress, Fascism and War - Page 531
By J. R. CAMPBELL

Roosevelt's New Deal - - - - - „ 543
By R. PAGE ARNOT

"Social-Credit" and the Petit-Bourgeoisie - „ 552
By MAURICE DOBB

For German Working-Class Unity! - - „ 558

Dialectical Materialism and Communism - „ 568
By L. RUDAS

Marx and Engels on the British Working-Class Movement - - - - - „ 578

World of Labour - - - - - „ 586

East London LABOUR MONTHLY Conference on the Future of Revolutionary Policy

Published at
7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1933 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 270 Broadway, Suite 1401, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from Workers' Bookshop, 16 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2.

Advertisement Rates : £8 os. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 os. od. per text page and pro rata ($\frac{1}{8}$th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 os. od.	*Volume VIII*	£1 1s. od.
Volume II	£3 3s. od.	*Volume IX*	15s. 6d.
Volume III	£3 3s. od.	*Volume X*	10s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XI*	10s. 6d.
Volume V	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XII*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XIII*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£1 1s. od.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue of *The Labour Monthly* since 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRADES UNION CONGRESS, FASCISM AND WAR

By J. R. CAMPBELL

THE Trades Union Congress will meet at Brighton in September on the eve of the fifth winter of the world economic crisis.

It will meet at a time when the short speculative " pick-up " in industry which was a feature of the midsummer months will have exhausted itself and when the reality of the coming winter will be seen to be, not a steady upsurge of " industrial recovery," but a deepening of the crisis confronting the working class with grave new problems.

Foremost amongst the features of this deepening crisis will be the intensifying currency and tariff battles for the shrinking world market on the part of the main industrial powers of the world.

The War Implications of Roosevelt's " New Deal "

In the United States of America the Roosevelt policy of the " new deal " is being boosted to the skies by a vast propaganda machine operating on a scale that has never before been experienced even in war time.

Roosevelt's " new deal " means a " new deal " for big business to be secured through the ruination of the workers, working farmers, and middle class.

A policy of currency inflation is being pursued, which in spite of alleged increases in wages by blanket codes and industrial codes, is sharply reducing the purchasing power of wages and salaries. Compulsory short time is being introduced disguised as the reduction of working hours. Compulsory labour at a dollar a week and food is being introduced for the young unemployed who are being forced to work in " Forestry Camps," by the very capitalist class who had the lying audacity to talk a few years ago about the " slave " labour in the Russian timber camps.

The " new deal " is already heading straight for compulsory arbitration. It is being put through by terrorism, by the shooting of strikers, by the use of tear bombs, in the teeth of a rising wave of strikes.

But the policy of inflation does not merely mean the reduction of the working class standard of life at home. It means a desperate struggle by means of currency inflation for an enlarged share of the world market.

NOTE:—Next month R.P.D. will resume his "Notes of the Month."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The " Daily Herald " talks War

Already Japan has entered on the path of inflation, and the *Daily Herald* begins to talk the language of war, as the following shows :

> " *The steady flood of cheap Japanese goods, underselling home markets, means that there is a " yellow peril ' of a definitely economic character. Japanese competition has become comparable with Germany's drive before* 1914 *in the world's market for manufactured goods.*
>
> " *Trade authorities agree that tariffs, no matter how high, cannot cope with the Japanese trade peril, but that a solution on an entirely different basis will have to be found.*" (August 8, 1933).

What will they say and do when the great imperialist giant, the U.S.A. (followed closely by Germany), begins on the basis of its depreciated currency and low wages to win a larger share of the shrinking markets of the world.

This terrific drive for the world markets is accompanied by the growth of Fascism and political reaction in the various capitalist countries. The Fascists are in power in Germany. The Fascist tendencies of the " new deal " in the U.S.A. have been commented upon by even the most superficial bourgeois observers, and in Britain the meaning of measures like the militarisation of the police is understood by all.

The Imperialists hasten their War Activities

That this deepening of the crisis intensifies the war danger is self-evident. The situation is more intense all round. The number of danger points in the relation of states has vastly increased.

To the danger of a Japanese attack on the Soviet Union in the Far East has been added the danger through the new aggressive policy of Hitlerism in the West.

The danger of war between Fascist Germany and the countries standing for the retention of the Versailles Treaty has reached a stage of extraordinary acuteness.

Under cover of the " new " deal in the U.S.A. and of talk of " our military inferiority " in Britain, war preparations are being rushed ahead by those great imperialist powers.

On the one hand British Imperialism continues its policy of mobilising the European nations against the U.S.A., on the other hand it replaces French Imperialism (for the moment more than preoccupied with Hitler) in the leadership of the anti-Soviet front.

How the T.U.C. Faces this Menace

That is the menacing situation that the Trades Union Congress will require to face.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In confronting this situation it is quite impossible for any union leader to pretend that " the workers are apathetic " ; " they will not fight " in view of the magnificent struggles of unorganised workers in Ford's, in the Hope strike, and in Firestone's. Not only was great fighting spirit displayed in these struggles, but leadership was quickly forthcoming out of the ranks of the workers. Powerful militant strike organisation was developed and hundreds of workers were recruited into the unions. Whatever other excuse for inactivity and sabotage the Trades Union Congress General Council may seek to find, the apathy of the workers can no longer be pleaded.

For Inflation and Why

It was to be expected that the Trades Union Congress leaders, in view of their past record, should fall for Roosevelt's new deal.

Did they not accept Woodrow Wilson's 14 points as the foundation of a new heaven and a new earth ? Were they not amongst the most unblushing boosters of Fordism and its British counterpart Mondism ?

The significance of that attitude is this. At some point of the Anglo-American struggle it may be necessary for British Imperialism to follow the U.S.A. in the path of competitive inflation. How much easier will be its task if it finds that the similar policy in the U.S.A. has been boosted by the Union leaders as a brave energetic way to recovery, instead of being as it is the most damnable intensification of the exploitation of the working class.

The Trades Union Congress General Council has always been inflationist. Did they not say in the joint memorandum which they and the Federation of British Industries presented to the Government on the occasion of the Ottawa Conference :

> We are convinced that one of the most urgent needs of the moment is to prevent any further fall in the wholesale price level and to restore wholesale prices to a level which will conduce to industrial activity.

Almost the Rooseveltian formula.

Did they not repeat this in their memorandum to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the World Economic Conference of which Chamberlain said that " there was very little in it to which I could take exception " (speech in Commons on June 2).

The delegates must oppose this co-operation with the capitalist class in competitive inflation. They must throw out with indignation the Boilermakers' resolution with its fulsome praise of Roosevelt's plan and sharply condemn all support on inflation even if accompanied by insincere demagogic demands for higher wages by a bureaucracy which, day after day, has ruthlessly sabotaged all the actual wage struggles of the workers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Preparing to Surrender to Fascism

On Fascism the General Council's line is crystal clear. It will try to blame the Communists for the coming to power of Hitler. It will assert that the best guarantee against the coming of Fascism to Britain is simply to continue to support the policy which the General Council and the Labour Party has been pursuing in recent years. Fascism may spread across Europe, Fascist tendencies may show themselves in Britain, but the General Council asserts that there is no need for a change in policy.

In pursuing this, however, the General Council has to resort to the most barefaced concealment of the facts.

Not even the vilest enemy of the German Communist Party, not even the denizens of the Trotskyist sewer have accused the German Communist Party of being prepared to surrender to Hitler. It fought Hitler before his coming to power, and it now continues to fight him relentlessly in the factory, at the Labour Exchange, and on the streets.

The Example of their German Colleagues

But it is a fact that the German General Council of the Trades Union Congress openly surrendered to Hitler; that they offered to co-operate with the Fascist Government; that they issued an appeal to all trade unionists to march in Hitler's Festival of Labour on May 1.

What did their own colleagues in the Woodworkers' International say about them after Hitler seized the German unions?

> In vain have been the many—all too many—declarations in which the trade unions adopting the platform of I.F.T.U. have stressed their political independence, and their preparedness to co-operate with the new régime in the economic and social fields, and even to being incorporated into the frame of the Fascist state.
>
> In vain has been their solemn protestations that the policy of the "free" trade unions had always been indestructibly linked up with the life and destiny of the German nation.
>
> In vain has been their appeal to the membership to take part everywhere in the May Day celebrations ordered by the Nazi Government. The 1st of May in Germany was no "People's Holiday," no "Festival of Labour," but an ignoble puppet show in celebration of an ignoble victory, not unlike those triumphal processions of ancient Roman imperators in which the vanquished had to march in pompous array to gratify the basest instincts of the gloating victors. (Quoted in Journal of Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers in July, 1933.)

The difference between the communists and the reformist both before and after the coming of Hitler to power is clear to every worker.

The surrender of the German Trade Union leadership to Hitler resulted from their whole previous policy. Their co-operation with the generals of the Kaiser in 1918-19 in building up the shattered capitalist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state machine, their suppression of the revolutionary working class, their splitting of the trade union movement, the support they gave to capitalist rationalisation, their advocacy of " economic democracy " (the German form of Mondism), led logically to the support of Hindenberg against Hitler as the lesser evil, to the flirtation with the militarist Von Schleicher, and then to the final surrender to Hitler himself.

Against Workers' Struggle, but for Capitalist Rationalisation

All the main trends of reformist policy in the German unions find their counterpart in the policy of the British reformists.

The British Trade Union leaders have rejected revolutionary trade unionism " as futile, certain to fail, and sure to lead to bloodshed and misery," they rejected the strike policy of " the unions fighting sectionally for improvements." They announced to the whole world that co-operation with the employers would lead to the workers getting a voice in the control of industry, and that it would lead to prosperity under capitalism.

> The ultimate policy of the movement can find more use for an efficient industry than a derelict one, and the unions can use their power to promote and guide the scientific reorganisation of industry as well as to obtain material advantages from the reorganisation.
>
> That policy affords the best hope of raising the status, security and standard of living of the workers whom the Council represents. (Report to 1928 Trades Union Congress.)

At the same time the German Trade Union leaders were saying :

> The book of " Henry Ford : My Life and Work," is surely the most revolutionary document in the whole economic literature up to this moment. (Tarnow, of the German Woodworkers' Union.)
>
> Up till recently the German working class has always stood for rationalisation. (He means the Trade Union bureaucracy, J.R.C.) As distinct from the English workers, the German workers have learned in the school of Marxism that all technical progress involves sacrifices, before it can effect an improvement in general working conditions.
>
> The German employers have every reason to thank the much abused Marxism which made it possible for them, without any noteworthy resistance of the working class, to carry through a rationalisation which threw hundreds of thousands of workers on to the streets. (Franz Hering in *Arbeit*, April, 1930).

The working out of this reformist policy in Germany has led to the very " bloodshed and misery " for the workers that the reformists said a revolutionary policy would bring about, and it has not raised but most emphatically lowered " the status, security and standard of living of the workers " of Great Britain.

For Capitalist " Democracy " against Workers' Dictatorship

The most notable resemblance of the two policies, however, is in their attitude towards Fascism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Secretary of the General Council, Mr. Citrine, in his capacity as Chairman of the International Federation of Trades Unions, announces that " the workers must present a united front to the enemy, but it must be based upon the principles of freedom and democracy." " We cannot ally ourselves with those who deny these principles. We remain ruthlessly opposed to dictatorship whether of the Right or the Left. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance. Let us take warning from the fate that has overtaken the German workers."

The meaning of the above is crystal clear. It is that unless the Communists bow down before the freedom and democracy of the capitalist parliamentary system (the concealed dictatorship of the capitalist class), and unless they will pledge themselves to the principle that a Revolutionary Workers' Government will guarantee " freedom and democracy " to the capitalist class so that they can resist the building up of Socialism, the General Council will refuse to have a united front with them or the revolutionary workers under their influence.

In short, rather than unite with the Communist Party and the independent Labour Party in a common struggle against Fascism, the General Council will work to keep the working class divided and ensure the triumph of Fascism.

Copying the " Lesser Evil " Path of Treachery

But the declaration that the united front must be based upon the principles of freedom and democracy has another side.

There are capitalist groups who prate about " freedom and democracy " while actually preparing the way for Fascism. Mr. Citrine's formula is not only a formula for splitting the ranks of the workers, it is a formula for the open co-operation of the Trade Unions with these groups as a lesser evil to Fascism. In other words, a formula which does not learn from the German reformist experience, but actually proposes to tread the same treacherous path.

What Can the Workers Do?

How can the delegates to the Trades Union Congress commence the fight against Fascism?

In the first place by demanding the complete scrapping of the Mondist policy. Only a few weeks ago the General Council was co-operating with the Federation of British Industries in making approaches to the Government on the question of " Empire Marketing." Do they think that the delegates to the Conference are imbeciles that they cannot see the absurdity of denouncing Fascism on the one hand and yet continuing to co-operate with the very capitalist class which is ruthlessly driving to Fascism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There can be no genuine fight on the part of the trade unions against Fascism that does not include their participation in the struggle to build up the united front of the workers on an agreed policy of common demands relating to wages, unemployment pay, the defence of the political rights of the workers.

Every wage cut, every retreat of a trade union without a struggle helps forward the Fascist developments. It encourages the capitalist class to proceed with the Fascisation of the state. It enables the Fascist demagogues to win support amongst the masses who are turning away from the trade union movement, disheartened by its surrender policy.

For a Fighting United Front against Fascism

If the fighting unity of the working class can be developed on an immediate programme of action, then the unions can be strengthened, organisation can be built up in the factories, heavy blows can be struck at the offensive of the capitalist class. On this basis not only the working class, but large elements of the lower middle class can be rallied to the banner of the working class and a solid front presented against the advance of Fascism.

To reject participation in the united front, to continue the policy of splitting the unions, to continue the policy of co-operation with the capitalist class is to clear the way for Fascism, and no resolutions (the German trade union leaders who licked Hitler's boots also passed resolutions against Fascism) against Fascism which the Congress passes will be anything but brazen hypocrisy and deception unless this fact is recognised.

Only by building the united front in struggle, and by undermining and destroying the rotten reformism which is dominant in the union movement, can the workers completely defeat the menace of Fascism.

How to Fight War

The dangerous war situation in the world to-day will be realised by every delegate. The presence of six resolutions against war on the agenda is a sufficient testimony of this.

But while the rank and file are trying to discover ways and means of fighting against war, the union leadership is manœuvring to rally the mass of the trade unionists behind their own government in the event of war breaking out.

It has always been a cardinal feature of Socialist policy, that it is useless to base working class policy in the event of a war upon the question of which side was the aggressor.

In the Great War of 1914-18 it was a matter of indifference as to which side fired the first shot. The war was not a struggle between bad

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" aggressor " countries and good " defender " countries. It was a war between two sets of thoroughly unscrupulous imperialist groups—the war being the outcome of the imperialist policies pursued by both.

Against the " Aggressor " or against One's Own Government

In such a situation it was not the business of the working class to find the aggressor—it was the business of the working class to fight its own imperialist government.

The International Federation of Trade Unions, to which the British T.U.C. is affiliated, wants to start the working class in a new search for the " aggressor."

In a resolution passed at its Brussels Conference it decided in favour of a general strike in the event of a likelihood of war. But not a general strike of the workers against their own imperialist governments. No! Only a strike of the workers in the " aggressor " country against the aggressor government. The workers in other countries have to side with their own governments who are charged with the task of boycotting the aggressor.

How on earth are the trade union officials to tell which country is the aggressor.

There are two ways of distinguishing the " aggressor " according to the International Federation of Trade Unions.

The first sign of the aggressor country is that it refuses to submit its case to arbitration as laid down by the League of Nations.

The League of Nations is a body of European Imperialist States and their satellites, dominated by France and Britain.

Suppose a crisis arises in the relations of Poland and Germany, both Fascist states, and that German capitalism refuses to submit the question to the League of Nations, on the ground that that body is effectively dominated by the allies of Poland and arbitration under its ægis would be simply a farce. Suppose that following this refusal war broke out.

The revolutionary Socialist would say that it was the duty of the working class in each belligerent country to struggle against its own war-like government, and that the workers in other countries should fight against their own governments participating in the struggle, and against the transport of munitions to either of the belligerents.

But the International Federation of Trade Unions says that this is entirely wrong. Because German Imperialism refuses to submit to arbitration of the League it has to be pronounced to be the " aggressor." The German working class is supposed to fight its warlike government, while the Polish working class is to be expected enthusiastically to support

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its warlike government. The workers in other countries are to refuse to load food and munitions for Germany, and to load them enthusiastically for Poland.

Now please note that this policy is adopted by a so-called international conference dominated by the trade union leaders of France, Britain and Poland. Was there ever a clearer case of trying to swing the unions behind their own imperialists ?

Nations outside the League of Nations are to be adjudged to be aggressors if they do not submit to arbitration under the Kellogg Pact.

Thus if the Soviet Union was involved in a dispute with a neighbouring capitalist state, no matter how conciliatory the Soviet Union proved to be, no matter how eager it was for a settlement by direct negotiation, if it refused to submit its case to the arbitration of a tribunal appointed by the capitalist governments of the world, it would be adjudged to be the aggressor and the workers in other countries would be expected to support their capitalist government in war on the Socialist Fatherland.

This attempt to swing the unions behind their own governments in view of the coming war is being camouflaged by talk about " democracy being the path to peace."

This is an attempt to convince the workers of France and Britain that their heavily armed imperialist governments, because they have up to the moment preserved parliamentary institutions are peace loving and must be supported in any war waged against the countries of dictatorship. (By this the union leaders mean the Soviet Union equally with Fascist Germany.)

This infamous policy must be smashed. The delegates must declare their wholehearted opposition to the warlike policy of their own government, must denounce the attempts of the General Congress leaders to identify the Soviet Union with the Fascist states, must stand up for the breaking of the chains of the Peace Treaty, which enslaves the German people, must defend the Soviet Union as a Workers' State, and must in every way oppose the armament building and other war preparations of the National Government. A necessary part of all this is the condemnation of the General Council's ban on the British Anti-War Council.

It is to the extent that we do these things now, creating a working-class opinion against the actual war policies that are being pursued, building up of the organisations of the working class in the munitions and transport industries, that we will be able to act effectively against war in the future.

The Two Alternatives facing T.U.C. Delegates

The delegates will be facing these grave questions at the beginning of the fifth winter of the crisis, when unemployment is growing, when the workers' cost of living is steadily rising.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The choice before them is clear. They can continue the present policy of the General Council—the policy of the united front with capitalism, or they can repudiate that policy and build up the united front of the working class.

Let the delegates be clear on this all important point. It is not the policy of the working class united front that is on trial. It is the policy of the united front with capitalism that must answer for its crimes—the policy that calls the concealed dictatorship of the capitalist class "democracy and freedom," the policy which cleared the way for the open capitalist dictatorship in Germany, the policy which has resulted in defeat after defeat for the British working class.

When one surveys the results of this policy one is amazed at the audacity with which it is defended by the Trade Union bureaucracy. To listen to a Citrine one would imagine that this policy has led to success upon success, instead of from disaster to disaster.

Consider the truly imbecile arguments of this bureaucracy against the United Front. "We can only have a united front with those who base their policy and programme on the principles of freedom and democracy."

Every trade unionist out of his own experience knows that this is imbecility, or treachery, or both. If the employers in a factory are attacking wages, does the trade unionist only seek to build up the front of resistance amongst "those who accept the principles of freedom and democracy?"

No! He seeks to bring into the front of resistance every worker, skilled or unskilled, young or old in the entire factory, not on the basis of his ultimate political principles, but on the basis of his willingness to resist the wage cut.

Yet the union leaders after arguing that Fascism is a thousand times more dangerous than any wage cut, proceed to argue that the united front against the advance of Fascism, should not be based upon the willingness of all workers to resist this menace, but should be confined to those who accept the theoretical beliefs of the Labour and Trade Union leaders about "freedom and democracy."

The trade unionists are being told that there is no need for an united front with the Communists, the I.L.P.'ers and the revolutionary workers. That the "real" united front is the Labour Party, the Unions and the Co-operators. As the leaders of these organisations are in daily co-operation with the capitalist class, the description of them as constituting the "real united front" against capitalism is clearly nonsense.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Surely it will be obvious to every delegate who is in touch with the realities of working-class life that to build up the front of the working class in the workshops and the localities, within a measurable period the united efforts of every active worker is necessary.

What is the Basis for a United Front?

So far from the official Labour bodies, with "their duly accredited officials" being the "only real united front," we have seen the front of the workers being built up in the Ford Strike, at Hope's, at Firestone's, quite independently of the "official" organisations in the first place, though resulting in their strengthening in the course of the struggle.

The delegates should brush aside those vile excuses for keeping the workers divided and fight for a united front of all workers on the basis of a programme of action.

Such a programme might be as follows:

1.—The Forty-Hour Week and the Seven-Hour Day for Miners.

2.—The Abolition of the Means Test, of Test and Task Work, of Labour Colonies, the Establishment of a United Front between the Trades Union Congress and the National Unemployed Workers' Movement.

3.—The Adoption of Schemes of Public Work at Trade Union Rates of Wages.

4.—Not a Penny Off Existing Real Wages, but a Ten Per Cent. Advance All Round. No Compulsory Arbitration.

5.—The Building of the United Front Against Fascism, the Repeal of all Anti-Working-Class Legislation, the Establishment of Factory Committees and Workers' Defence Corps.

6.—The Establishment of Trade Union Democracy.

7.—The Organised Drive of the Unions Against the War Policy of the National Government and in Defence of the U.S.S.R. and for a New and Better Anglo-Russian Trade Agreement.

8.—Co-operation With All Other Working-Class Organisations for the above aims.

This or a similar programme of action will have to be fought for not only at the Trades Union Congress, but in every workshop and in every union branch.

It can only be fought for on the basis of militant trade unionists and militant branches coming together in order to battle for it against the entrenched forces of the reformist leadership.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is what the bureaucracy fear. Themselves an organised force within the union, with their picked supporters in every branch and workshop, battling step by step in defence of the bankrupt Mondist policy, they nevertheless denounce any attempt of the militants to get together to confront them in an organised way.

They have no objection they say to individuals or branches expressing a militant point of view, they only object to their coming together in a rank-and-file movement—in other words, to their taking steps to make their militancy effective.

The more the bureaucracy object to the militants coming together in the rank-and-file movement, the more urgent it becomes to develop those movements as a means to developing the united front in the industry, to making every union branch an organ of the class struggle, to making every factory a fortress of the united working-class movement, to ensuring that every strike is controlled by the workers—in short, to ensuring that the barriers erected by reformism in the way of united working-class struggle are levelled to the ground forever.

No. 3 of the

Labour Monthly Reprints at a 1d.

will be

"The Manifesto of the Communist Party of Ireland"

(*Adopted at its inaugural Conference held on June 4th and 5th*)

•

See Press and the next issue for further details of terms, etc., of this historic document

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROOSEVELT'S NEW DEAL

By R. PAGE ARNOT

I.—The New Godhead in the United States

A NEW God has been discovered in America : not the God of the Mormons, or the God of the Christian Scientists, but the God of the Socialists. His name is Roosevelt, and his divinity is loudly proclaimed by his socialist worshippers in Europe. From Brailsford and Bertrand Russell to Citrine and Leon Blum, the chorus tells of the majesty, the power and the glory of their new Baal whose seat is in Washington and whose hand is stretched out to rescue mankind. Ever since March these priests of Baal have been shouting their hosannas and leaping on his altar in their frenzy. For Roosevelt hath delivered them from evil, and hath found a way out of the crisis that is not the way of Marx. Just as Lloyd George with his " rare and refreshing fruit " once warned the workers against " the wild and poisonous berries of Karl Marxism," so Brailsford tells the workers to look to the West and, where he once saw Hoover superseding Marx, now once again sees Roosevelt as the saviour. Bertrand Russell, still sore from his 1920 voyage on the Volga, writes an article on " Revolution without Tears in America," chants his praise of this " veritable revolution without violence," this " virtually a system of Socialism but without the class antagonisms," and opens out the profoundest depths of his aristocratic soul in a paragraph wherein he explains that Marxist Socialism " has been largely inspired by envy."

And when we turn from these " deeper thinkers " to the daily newspaper writers and the trade union leaders, the same adoration is displayed. The *Daily Herald* hails the Roosevelt policy as similar to the Labour Party's Scarborough policy. Citrine in his presidential address to the International Federation of Trade Unions declares himself " impressed with the courage and vision displayed by the President of the United States " who, he says, was carrying out the programme of the I.F.T.U. Finally the reformist leaders of the Boilermakers' Society proclaim that they too have found the new god in their resolution to the Trades Union Congress :

> That this Congress demands action on the part of the British Government to deal with unemployment on broad and comprehensive lines, similar to those laid down in the Bill presented to the United States Congress by President Roosevelt.
>
> Congress believes that this Bill definitely marks the breakdown of the capitalist system in America, and having regard to the fact that unemployment is an inherent part of all capitalistic systems, further urges on the Government of this country the necessity of at once developing schemes for the complete nationalisation of all basic industries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor does the new Baal disappoint his worshippers. In the lofty accents that recall Woodrow Wilson (an earlier deity of British reformists) Roosevelt proclaims his high mission, thunders against "the money-changers in the seat of the temple," and announces his care for the common people. The Good Shepherd feeds his flock.

The whole six months from spring to autumn have been like a great religious revival. American workers, in scores of thousands, may revolt in strike after strike and be met by police batons, and gas bombs. But to the new god the incense from his "socialist" worshippers still rises to his nostrils, and in the trade union leaders of Europe and America there is found the congregation of the True Believers.

Such is the condition of reformist socialism in the fifth year of the World Economic Crisis!

II.—Ballyhoo

What is happening in the U.S.A.? What are the facts? To these questions it is hard for the plain man to get an answer, so befogged is the atmosphere, so filled with propaganda from Roosevelt, interpretative propaganda from his worshippers here in Europe, cross-talk by politicians and special correspondents, and general confused clamour by all the economists. The air is smoky with incense to Roosevelt and thick with corresponding denunciations of Marxism and the U.S.S.R. The substantial and ugly realities of United States capitalism have passed out of vision: and all is become insubstantial, fantastic. Roosevelt's demagogy is not his real intentions, his real intentions are not his surface plans, and his actual plans are belied each few weeks by performance: and finally Roosevelt is not Roosevelt the saviour, but simply the executive head of the United States, carrying out the policy of American imperialism.

President Roosevelt himself said in the spring: "You cannot ballyhoo a nation back into prosperity." Yet ballyhoo is precisely what Roosevelt has been doing. Bluff, bunk, and ballyhoo—these American words—might have been invented to describe his "New Deal." Two years and more ago British economists and journalists were patronisingly calling the U.S.S.R. a "great experiment" while they hoped for its failure. Now the victorious Pyatiletka is the great reality that they resolutely shun, while the New capitalist Deal has become the "great experiment," for whose success they hope. Under all these circumstances the first step towards understanding what is happening in America is to get rid of all the ballyhoo, to realise that a thousand weekly repetitions in the press and discussions of its pros and cons do not make it into reality. Even Mr. Citrine's approval of fiction cannot lend it a real existence.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And then behind the ballyhoo the facts remain and can be discovered, namely, that American capitalist economy has reached its deepest crisis yet; that something between 16 and 17 million were workless, without any insurance; that the farmers (nearly half the population is agricultural) were ruined, bankrupt under a crushing load of debts and taxes; that production had sunk to the level of the 19th century; that all the Hoover efforts to get capitalism out of the crisis had only thrust it deeper into the mire, and that his Presidency had finally ended in the stink of a bank crisis, when the whole banking system broke down and panic spread among the petty bourgeoisie. Further that this opportunity was seized by the finance-oligarchy of America, using the fresh Democratic Presidency, to carry through a most ruthless and gigantic effort to get out of the crisis at the expense of the working class, the farmers, the colonies, and the imperialist rivals of the U.S.A.; and that this effort was combined with a campaign of demagogy on an equally gigantic scale.

III.—Dressed in Brief Authority

The powers granted to the President have a singularly impressive appearance; and surely the Special Session of the 73rd Congress of the U.S. has justified both democracy and dictatorship, for here, it would seem, is a democratic congress freely granting dictatorial powers. The Old World is ill-balanced, as Mr. Hugh Dalton could tell you, divided between democracies and dictatorships: and have we not once more called the New World to redress the Old? Suchlike arguments as these, however, can be left until after we have examined the presidential powers.

The President is empowered, chiefly by the Emergency Banking Act, the Farm Relief Act (the inflation law), and the National Industrial Recovery Act (N.I.R.A.)

(*a*) to close all banks in the country and to dictate the terms on which they may reopen;

(*b*) to reduce Civil Service salaries and veterans' pensions to the amount of some $500 millions (which he did);

(*c*) to enlist a "civilian army" of 250,000 men to be paid $1 a day, to be employed in afforestation, &c.;

(*d*) to levy a tax on agricultural processing and to pay a bounty to farmers from the proceeds thereof;

(*e*) to refinance farm mortgages;

(*f*) to provide for drastic reductions in farm acreage;

(*g*) to reduce the gold content of the dollar by 50 per cent.;

(*h*) to issue up to $3,000,000,000 of Treasury currency;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*i*) to restrict foreign imports ;

(*j*) to institute licences for all business enterprises, without which licences no business might legally be carried on ;

(*k*) to fix " codes of fair competition " for trades or industries.

It must be understood, of course, that Roosevelt may not do all that for which he has powers, and that demagogy is not limited to speeches : but that permissive powers (which may never be enforced) when put into an Act of Congress can also be used to deceive masses of farmers and workers. Things are not what they seem, even in the newest of laws. Let us take as example a first processing tax (of 30 cents on the bushel of wheat then (in June) standing at about 76 cents), was imposed and followed by one of 6 cents per lb. on cotton. But the proceeds were not given as a simple bounty to the farmers. They were applied to reduce acreage by payments of as little as $6 for each acre withdrawn from cultivation. That is to say, the net result from a social standpoint of these particular powers of the President is *the destruction of agriculture.*

Again, of the first moneys to be expended under N.I.R.A. for Public Works, and estimated at some 500 millions, nearly half thereof (238,000,000) was briskly devoted by the President to immediate naval construction, that is for war preparations. This matches other results of the Disarmament Conference ; but no doubt Mr. Arthur Henderson, the latest admirer of Roosevelt, will be able to explain that it is yet another move for Peace on Earth.

Nevertheless, with such a formidable list of powers it might seem that even a capitalist President cannot but use them " for the good of mankind " as his own trumpets proclaim him to be doing. Therefore it is necessary to analyse more carefully what *in practice* these powers may mean.

IV.—The Kernel

When thus analysed the kernel objectives of American Imperialism's policy, of these gigantic and ruthless schemes to find a way out of the crisis at the expense of the petty bourgeois, the farmers and, above all, the workers, turn out to be as follows :—

1. *Unbounded development of monopoly : unhampered growth of trusts and the trustification of all American industry.* The Sherman Anti-Trust Laws, one of the " victories " of petty bourgeois democracy which for twenty years had to be circumvented by the trusts, are now completely suspended by N.I.R.A. Prices are to be raised : and they will be monopoly prices. " Unfair competition is to be done away with," which means the " elimination " by the trusts of the crowd of " unfair " small competitors.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. *An intensified fight for the world market.* All markets, including fenced colonial markets of its rivals, *with the depreciated dollar as the first weapon*, are to be penetrated. The Secretary of State for Agriculture, Wallace, given large powers under the Farm Relief Act, threatened on August 16 that if American demands are not met (at the International Wheat Conference) by August 24, then he will cut into every market, including Eastern ports with "dumped" American wheat or "subsidised exports" as he squeamishly insisted it should be called.

The effect on British trade prospects was immediately apparent. The alarm was expressed week after week in the commercial journals this summer.

> The immediate factor which emerges from the inflationary policy of the American Administration as a practical issue for the British exporter is that the power of the United States to compete in the Latin American markets increases directly in proportion to the decline in the exchange value of the dollar . . . . the advantage gained by British interests following Great Britain's departure from the gold standard has been in great part nullified in the face of competitive American interests.

Thus the *Times Trade and Engineering Supplement* on July 22, and a week later, it continues in the same strain, but with its apprehensions shifted to North America, as follows :—

> Recent exchange developments, however, mean a more intensified competition between exporters in the United States and the United Kingdom in selling their products in the Dominion [of Canada] . . . .

By the middle of August the alarm is once more sounded on the Latin American front.

> American statesmen contemplate a big drive in South America to extend American export trade.—*Times Trade and Engineering Supplement*, August 12, 1933.

Apart from Lancashire cotton, which was too busy contemplating its throat being cut by Japanese competition to make much pother about America, practically every British industry joined in bewailing the depreciated dollar.

A study of other European capitalist countries would show a like result ; each one making the same plaint as British motor cars, or British coal :—

> When Britain departed from the gold standard, exporters found themselves in a position to compete with United States coal in markets dominated by America, and in the past eighteen months considerable progress has been recorded. With the dollar back around the old parity, the competitive advantage which arose from the fall in sterling has been practically lost.—*Manchester Guardian Commercial*, July 15, 1933.

3. *An intensified fight for the home market.* Under N.I.R.A. the President is empowered to impose a general embargo, set up restrictive import quotas, license importers, or raise tariffs to any height in order to protect American industry from foreign competition arising out of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

application of the Act. No time has been lost by the Administration. As these lines are being written a news agency from Washington states (August 22) :—

> New anti-dumping tariffs are awaiting the signature of Mr. Acheson, the Under-Secretary of the Treasury, affecting certain acids from Holland; Portland cement from Denmark, Great Britain and Cuba ; woven wire from Germany ; rubber sole footwear, incandescent lamps and calcium carbide from Japan ; sulphite paper from Sweden ; rocksalt from Canada; steel products from France, Germany, the Saar and Belgium ; binder twine from England ; and tacks from Germany.—*Exchange Telegraph.*

Meantime French Imperialism has answered the dollar depreciation and the U.S.A. tariff threats by huge increases in customs duties, under M. Daladier's " blanket code " for fiscal retaliation. The World Economic Conference is hardly decently buried before the participants are coming to most desperate encounters in the war of trade.

4. *Intensified exploitation of the workers.* The " New Deal," for example, stimulates *rationalisation*, not only by its fostering of the big trusts, who are the vanguard rationalisers, but by its short hours (with corresponding speed-up to a degree impossible when hours were longer), and has already shown this in figures. According to the Federal Reserve Board figures, there was an increase in production from March to June of this year of 50 per cent. with an increase in employment of only 7.8 per cent. : in the Ford plants production went up by 10 per cent. over last year, and the number of workers declined by 20 per cent.

The other effects on the workers will be dealt with in more detail later.

5. *Extension of dominion of finance capital over the whole economy of the U.S.A.* This is seen in the exploitation of the farmers who are " rescued " from smaller moneylenders and brought into the closer grasp of the finance-oligarchy, both directly and through the medium of the state mortgage purchases. It is seen in the Emergency Banking Act, which did not mean that Roosevelt had chained up the old dragon of the wheat pit and put Wall Street under his footstool, but that on the contrary Wall Street put chains on 25,000 lesser banks (a survival in the U.S.A. of early 19th century banking) and led the small depositors captive. In one day America, in this respect backward economically, leaped forward through decades. It is seen in the code, which is bound to eliminate the smaller competitors.

6. *Squeezing the Colonies.* This was made particularly clear in the " spoof " Independence of the Philippines bill, the object of which was to place these islands, not beyond the grasp of American Imperialism, but just outside the American tariff walls which would enable its industries to be ruined by the trusts operating on the mainland of the U.S.A. A still further example was the policy of the sugar producers, who used

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their power to squeeze Cuba to the point when the position became intolerable for the Cuban masses, and its tyrant President, Machado, was overthrown.

7. *War preparations.* Apart from the diversion of half the immediate Public Works appropriation, as mentioned above, for the building of 32 new warships, the whole of N.I.R.A. fits in with the American War Department, which like the " Socialist " Paul Boncour in France, has set forth its plans to mobilise labour and industry for war. The famous codes have a remarkable resemblance, *in time of peace*, to the system of the British Munitions Act. The " civilian army " of a quarter of a million is to be stationed in camps, under military control.

8. *Inflation.* This is to be seen in the cheapened dollar; in the " anticipatory " rise of commodity and share prices; and finally in the Executive's huge inflationary powers to the use of which, in spite of all the attendant risks, finance-capital is rapidly driving. Those who listen to the Labour Party advocating an inflationary rise in prices here would do well to notice that the first effect in the U.S.A. has been a rapid rise in retail prices (amounting to 20 per cent. in certain foodstuffs by mid-summer: and in certain textile goods to 100 per cent. by the end of July), and consequent fall in real wages. The inflationary price rise has made a temporary market mainly of producers, who have hastened to purchase their raw materials and fill up their stocks. Inflation not only robs the workers, but expropriates the holdings of the farmers and smaller capitalists for the benefit of the finance-capital.

9. *Monopoly capital fusing more and more with the State.*

This process, the evidence for which is sufficiently obvious, requires special treatment for any discussion and cannot be dealt with here; but it may be remarked that so far from its being primarily the extension of State control over the trusts, as the worshippers would have it, it represents an enormous extension of control over the State machine by the finance-oligarchy.

V.—Social-Democratic Fallacies

Those who look to the " New Deal " as an escape from the analysis of Marxism tell us, when they condescend to details, that it means Planned Economy, and for the workers a Minimum Wage, Short Hours, Increased Purchasing Power, &c. The reality is far different, as a few examples will show.

" To eliminate unfair competition " is in the title of N.I.R.A.: but in practice it is the squeezing out of the small capitalist by the large, paving the way to intensified competition between the trusts, and on a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world scale. Planned Economy, which this is not, is only possible in a country where Socialism is being consciously built by the workers organised as the ruling class. The harvest in the U.S.S.R. as a result of this, and of the Five Year Plan, is being greatly increased. The harvest in the U.S.A. is being diminished, crops are being destroyed, and industrial plant "eliminated." In the U.S.S.R. planned production takes the place of "anarchy of production": in the U.S.A. planned destruction is taking place, but so ineffectively as to result in "anarchy of destruction." They are building machines and reaping the harvest in the U.S.S.R. (Marxism in practice): in the U.S.A. they are breaking up machines and destroying the harvests.

The wondrous "blanket code" which left our social-democrats gaping, its purpose served, was soon modified (to the advantage of the capitalists) in the separate codes, drawn up in consultation with the Morgans and Rockefellers. But the whole wages policy of the "New Deal" does not bear examination. It began with the rejection of the War Veterans' bonus and the economy cut of $500,000,000 in civil service salaries and war pensions. It continued with the substitution for unemployment relief of militarised forced labour camps, where the pay of a dollar a day drives down all standard rates. The minimum wage, which in any case meant averaging all wages, both high and low, actually congeals money wages at a fixed level, hard to alter, at a moment when prices are rising rapidly and real wages therefore falling.

Increased purchasing power is shown by the drop this summer below the 1932 level of department store sales, to exist only in the speeches of Roosevelt and his British echoes. It is decreased purchasing power that cheaper dollar and dearer goods are bringing to the masses.

But surely Shorter Hours, 30 hours a week is a real boon, say our Social-Democrats, who would wish to persuade us the moon is made of green cheese, if only Roosevelt said so. This provision, dubbed with the Labour names of "Shorter Hours" (remember Hitler's May Day and his "Labour Front") is nothing but Hoover's "stagger" plan, universalised over American industry. This "stagger" system by which the boss employs additional workers without any addition to his total wages bill, throws the whole cost of unemployment to be borne by all the workers themselves. It is the American capitalists' alternative to unemployment insurance. Moreover, by this means the boss can enormously intensify speed-up, sucking a week's labour-power out of each worker in three days.

What is left when all these social-democratic castles in the air vanish, when "Shorter Hours" is shown to be as much a deception as Bertrand Russell's "System of Socialism," or Arthur Henderson's "Disarmament"? There is left the unmistakable conclusion, not that the British

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worshippers of the new godhead are fools, but that, in the words of the 12th Plenum of the Communist International :—

> Social-Democracy adapts its ideology to the requirements of the crisis policy of the financial oligarchy.

But the analysis of Marxism, which they feverishly seek to prove obsolete, is once more vindicated by the realities of the " New Deal." Once more we see crisis leading to concentration and centralisation of capital, to lower costs of production, to intensification of labour, to rationalisation. And the whole-world analysis of Marxism continuing in the Communist International is overwhelmingly borne out by the latest events in America.

The " New Deal " which Mussolini has described as containing the essence of Fascism, has not led the farmers into the Promised Land : it has not been a way of salvation for the workers, whose attitude is sufficiently shown by their strike actions. The " New Deal " is a " raw deal " for the working masses of America.

It will not find an economic way out of the crisis : nor will it lead to peace and prosperity. On the contrary, in the last six months American capital has been rapidly entering a new stage, a stage of gigantic struggles between the classes and between the Imperialist powers. The real prospect in America is Wars and revolution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"SOCIAL CREDIT" AND THE PETIT-BOURGEOISIE

By MAURICE DOBB

THE *petit-bourgeois* mind to-day is being acutely affected by the cracking of the economic foundations of its little world. In more "normal" times the *petit-bourgeois* is wont to contemplate this little world, in the manner of pre-Copernican astronomy, as revolving round himself and his small privileges or possessions. Hence when the disturbing force comes it presents itself to him as some bolt from the blue—some monstrous abnormality, or act of the devil. Formerly he looked round for an individual villain of the piece and for an individual saviour to set things right. To-day the *petit-bourgeois* who has read his H. G. Wells and his Sir James Jeans regards the economic world as a machine, attributes all evil to a simple mechanical flaw in its running, and calls reason and the "expert" to his aid to put the machine in running order again.

To such a *petit-bourgeois* rationalism the Social Credit theories which are current to-day make a strong appeal and are attracting a considerable following. While their particular manifestations are various, all alike share this common feature. To put it in Marxist terms they claim that the contradictions of capitalism exist primarily in the sphere of the circulation—in the monetary mechanism—and that a "rational" alteration of this process of commodity-circulation will suffice to inaugurate the millenium. For such theories the class basis of capitalism does not exist, or is of subordinate importance. Not the hunt for surplus-value and production for profit, not the individual ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of a dispossessed proletariat, but a simple mechanical flaw in the way in which money circulates is responsible for the present crisis, for poverty and for unemployment. Not a social revolution—a question of class power and class ownership—but a simple alteration in accounting methods is what is required to set things right. Capitalist and worker alike, have a common grievance against "Finance" and the credit system.

So far as scientific pretension goes—and this is a principal attraction to the *petit-bourgeois* mind—the various species of Social Credit theory have a common root in the theory associated with the name of Major Douglas. The kernel of Major Douglas' theory consists in a simple diagnosis of the "flaw" in the present system. From this diagnosis

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whole of the rest follows : on its validity the adequacy of its practical proposals depends.

This " flaw " is so simple that one is surprised that no-one has thought of it before! Purchasing-power, says Major Douglas (whether in the hands of capitalists or workers) is created by payments made to individuals in the course of the productive process. These payments Major Douglas calls " A payments." But the cost of goods turned out by the productive process and placed on the market for sale is made up, not only of A payments, but also of " payments made to other organisations (raw materials, bank charges and other external costs)," which he calls " B payments." " Now, the rate of flow of purchasing-power to individuals is represented by A ; but since all payments go into prices, the rate of flow of prices cannot be less than A + B . . . Since A will not purchase A + B, a proportion of the production at least equivalent to B must be distributed by a form of purchasing-power which is not comprised under A."[1] Therefore, unless the banking system adopts a policy of continually expanding credit (*i.e.*, of inflation), goods equivalent to B must remain unsold. To remedy this, it is proposed so to control the credit and pricing-process as to reduce prices compulsorily below cost (A + B)—roughly in the ratio which B bears to A + B ; and to make up the resulting loss to manufacturers and traders by the issue of special credits through banks specially created or reorganised for this purpose.

The fallacy lying behind this pretentious discovery is also a simple one. It is that *B payments become A payments at an earlier stage of production.* It is the familiar fallacy of composition—of looking at the position of one firm alone and in isolation, and then generalising from it to the whole, instead of viewing the whole as a unified process. For instance, the " costs " of iron divide into payments to iron workers and iron capitalists (A payments) and payments for coal and ore (B payments). But the latter (the price paid for coal and ore) becomes payments to workers or capitalists (A payments) at the earlier mining stage of production. To this objection the Douglasist usually retorts that such B payments will not resolve into A payments *in the same unit of time.* But this is not true, if a constant rate of production is maintained, and a constant level of credit-financing by the banks (*i.e.*, renewals of credit equalling credit-repayments). Then the amount of coal being bought by the iron industry each month will equal the amount of coal being currently mined (and hence the current flow of wages and profits in the mining industry). Only if a crisis has *already intervened* (*i.e.*, from some *other*, and more fundamental, cause), with a resulting declining rate of output and of employment, will this cease to be true.

[1] *Credit Power and Democracy*, 21-2 ; also Capt. W. Adams, *Real Wealth and Financial Poverty*, 215 *seq.*, c.f. more recently a pamphlet published by the Douglas Credit Movement of Victoria, *Social Credit Lecturing Technique*, where this proposition is reproduced verbatim, and *The Nation's Credit* by C.G.M.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course, it is true that capitalism is marked by a wastage of productive powers and by the neglect and decay of latent potentialities of science and rational organisation. It is true that in the phase of crisis, which has now become chronic, derangements of the monetary and credit mechanism supervene and exact a further, and cumulative, influence on the industrial situation. But the Douglas theory makes no mention of the deeper causes of recurring crises and wastage of productive powers which lie in the *class* nature of capitalist production as *production for profit*—as a hunt for surplus-value. What appears to the *petit-bourgeois* eye as " under-consumption " is simply one facet of capitalist over-production—that is, expansion of production beyond the point which yields a " normal " profit to capital. Capitalist over-production is entirely relative to *profit*, and for that reason does not exist in the socialist economy of U.S.S.R., since every expansion of production can always be distributed then by the simple device of lowering the price or by raising wages. But capitalist over-production cannot be cured in this way, since it is a " solution " at the expense of profit. The now-discredited Fordist " solution " of higher wages is no solution under capitalism, precisely because dearer labour must mean less surplus-value. For the same reason, all the familiar " nostrums " of " more spending " or " more purchasing power " (*i.e.*, inflation), can have real meaning only as more spending by *capitalists* (*i.e.*, less accumulation and more luxury-parasitism) or else as *lower real wages* for the workers. And that in fact is what all these " spend more " and " inflation " campaigns amount to *in practice.*

But to analyse " Social Credit " in its purely technical aspect is neither to dispose of it nor to reveal its full political significance. Indeed, its technical pretensions seem, in the main, to be simply a rationalistic focus for deeper political attitudes. The movement represented by Douglas himself is actually rootedly conservative. Douglas began his *Credit Power and Democracy* by an attack on the " fallacies of Marxianism." He put forward his scheme expressly as an *alternative* to the " misdirected " aspirations of the post-war Labour Movement towards Socialism and Workers' Control; and he defines his critique as being levelled only at " certain features of the so-called Capitalist System." His aim is merely by appropriate " lobbying " of " key " individuals (Treasury officials, Ministers and big business men) to persuade them by the conviction of pure reason to operate his scheme, while leaving capitalism in all other respects to continue intact. In his scheme of change the workers have no place. Said the Social Credit organ, *The New Age* (October 16, 1924): " There is nothing to prevent its *immediate* inauguration by the Government and the Banks. . . . . It solves the problem of harmonising the interests of the capitalist and the worker within the industrial system." Says *The New English Weekly* (January 26,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1933): " If by Capitalism is understood the system of competitive production for profit, it can be said that the required change would not involve its destruction but only its regulation."

But in its more popular aspect, as a popular *movement*, it has a much more radical significance. And precisely here the purely technical arguments of its master have less weight. Here it shades off, on the one hand, into the various kindred brands of " credit-crankery " (the " consumers' credit " of Foster and Catchings and the vaguer Technocracy in U.S.A.; the " inflationism " sponsored by some academic economists in this country), and, on the other hand, into the various " under-consumption " theories which advocate " more purchasing power " for the workers and *petit-bourgeoisie* as a " cure " for capitalism in crisis. All of these are knit together by a vague anti-capitalist discontent, which, because it has no roots in the working-class struggle, is deluded by appearance into blindness to the real nature of things, and focuses its criticism, not on the fundamental class contradiction of capitalism, but on certain *aspects* of things which come closest to the *petit-bourgeois* eye—the aspect of consumption and of purchasing power. While this heterogeneous movement is radical and anti-capitalist in its roots, and can even at times claim to be " revolutionary " in its temper, its ideology is in fact reactionary and counter-revolutionary. For the common factor of all these credit and consumption theories is the belief that the evils of capitalism can be cured, *within* the class framework of capitalist society, by readjustment of the monetary and credit mechanism. The banker becomes the devil of the piece (with sometimes the *rentier*, fattening on deflation, added to his retinue). Let the capitalist class (itself the fellow-victim of finance) remain and prosper; but let a different pilot be put at the wheel of the credit-machine.

It is in this dual aspect—its radical appeal and its reactionary objective—that the purely Fascist significance of all this Social Credit ideology becomes plain. The novelty of Fascism as an historical movement—the product of capitalism in decline—is that it combines the adoption of gangster-politics to smash the working-class movement with an elaborate demagogic façade of " radical demands " to attract the *petit-bourgeoisie* and declassed elements, radicalised by the crisis, and so to prevent their union with the working class. We now know beyond need of further witness the rôle which Social-Democracy plays in preparing the way for Fascism. So here we see the British Labour Party making its bow to the ideology of Social Credit by focussing the issue at the last election, not on class against class, but on " the bankers' ramp." It does not matter that the " radical demands " which Fascism uses are hollow and meaningless. Such it is their purpose to be: to be valued solely for their effect upon the ear. Mixed with a modicum of bribes—the spoils of *pogrom*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movements and some " welfare schemes " for the faithful—such high-sounding slogans do their work in bewitching the *petit-bourgeois* mind, precisely because the latter has no deeper vision into capitalist society. Similarly the influence of Social Credit ideology lies in its pseudo-radicalism, in its scientific pretence and its appeal to reason. Its significance lies in its setting up of the expert as against the working-class movement, and in canalising *petit-bourgeois* discontent with capitalism, instead of into revolutionary politics based on a Marxist understanding of the process of history, harmlessly against certain sham " bogeys."

That to attribute such Fascist significance to the Social Credit ideology is no idle debating abuse, is shown by a number of facts. Mosley started his independent career with excursions into Social Credit; and while to-day he has put " planning " and the Corporative State into the foreground of his propaganda, he makes demogogic use of attacks on financiers and the *rentier* and on inherited wealth. " Our aim throughout " he says, " is to rid productive industry of its financial burdens. . . . We must distinguish (in taxation) between the producer and the usurer " (*Greater Britain*, p. 130). Ezra Pound, the latest convert to Social Credit from the ranks of the former guild Socialist *The New Age*, mixes praise of Mussolini with advocacy of Major Douglas.[2] It is well known what a part has been played in Hitler demagogy by the talk about the " Jewish bankers " and " international finance "; and Wyndham Lewis in his eulogistic study of *Hitler* points out that the economic program of the Nazi Party is based on the claim that " the arch-enemy is not *Das Kapital* pure and simple, as with Marx, but *Das Zeih Kapital*, or Loan Capital " (p. 148). " Hitler was a sort of inspired *German peasant*," says Wyndham Lewis. " The characteristic interests of the peasant-proprietor and small trader are here found written all over these programmes of reform. . . . The interest of the industrialist, so it seems, is in many ways identical with that of the peasant. . . . There you have at Hitler's side the great German industrialist Hugenberg. . . . What in the field of practical politics spurred him to action may be summed up in the one word *Debt* " (pp. 156, 176, 177-8). " The whole of this Hitlerist movement is, on the economic side, little else but a most revolutionary form of credit-crankery ! " (p. 164).

Wyndham Lewis then proceeds to point out that this ideology is virtually the same as that of the Douglas movement sponsored by T. S. Eliot, the Anglo-Saxon high priest of aristocratic cultural conservatism; as that outlined in the original Mosley Memorandum; and as much of the ideology of the Labour Movement. (He quotes a speech by Kirkwood and comments : " With a few slight changes that could be an address by

[2] *A.B.C. of Economics.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a Hitlerist deputy "—pp. 200-1).[3] Says the Hitler program: " In credit-slavery all peoples and governments find themselves, who bow to the might of Loan Capital."

Concrete evidence that the attitude of the leaders of the Social Credit movement to the working class is closely parallel to that of a Hitler or a Mussolini is shown by a " Social-Credit Scheme for Scotland " recently prepared by Major Douglas himself.[4] As conditions of his scheme for a " national dividend " to all he includes the following :—

> Wage-rates in all organised industries to be reduced by 25 per cent.
>
> Any trade union violating a wage agreement to render its membership liable to suspension of national dividend.
>
> " For a period of five years after the initiation of this scheme, failure on the part of any individual to accept employment in whatever trade, business or vocation he was classified in the last census . . . would render such individual liable to suspension of benefit in respect of the national dividend."

In other words, the " national dividend " is to be used as an instrument to weaken trade unions and to coerce individual workers.

Clearly it is important by a wider popularisation of Marxism to sap the intellectual basis of such theories. At the same time this by itself is not enough. The basis of such beliefs will have to be undermined by concrete experience—concrete experience of the class realities of capitalism. The development of the militant working-class movement itself is the only sure antidote to Fascism, as also to its satellite creeds—the growth of a militant movement which, on the basis of the class struggle, draws the radicalised elements of the *petit-bourgeoisie* into united front activities, in which they learn by concrete experience of political struggle what is the real nature of capitalism and where the only complete solution for the collapse of civilisation lies. Of special moment in this connection is the spreading of knowledge in the widest circles of the achievements of socialist construction in U.S.S.R. : of the way in which the productive forces are simultaneously unleashed and harnessed anew under the planned socialism of a Workers' State. This needs to be done, not in the manner of painting a paradise or of chanting a " hallelujah chorus " ; but by showing how achievement comes, not like manna from heaven, but by Marxist handling of an historical problem and by the concrete handling of each situation in its turn and in its setting. And that is one aspect of the crucial importance of united front activity at the present hour.

---

[3] It is perhaps significant that the leader of the Labour Party should write a Preface to a recent book entitled *Free Money : a Way Out of the Money Maze*, in which the " Gesell Scheme " of money reform is advocated. Mr. Lansbury says : " Labour will fight for national control of banking and investment institutions."

[4] Published in *The Evening Times* of Glasgow, March 11, 1932.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR GERMAN WORKING-CLASS UNITY!

[*An open letter from the Central Committee of the German Communist Party to all Social-Democratic workers of Germany dated June 20, 1933.*]

DEAR SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC COMRADES,

WE Communists must and will speak to you. The political events of the last few months have confronted every worker with the questions: how can we overthrow Fascist Dictatorship, how to defend ourselves against Fascist terrorism, how to free our political prisoners, how can we fight for bread and work, how avert the crushing of the workers' movement, how to prevent new, bloody imperialist wars?

But we cannot look into the future unless we consider the lessons of the past. How did Hitler's dictatorship become possible? Why has "democracy" led, not to Socialism, but Fascism? How are we to achieve political power? How can we build up Socialism in Germany? All these are questions which urgently demand an answer.

Class comrades! These questions must be threshed out. It is impossible to stand aside, useless to indulge in loud complaints at the horror and brutality of Fascism. Karl Marx had said that:—"the liberation of the working class can only be achieved by the workers themselves."

Bear in mind this basic truth of Marxism. If you do this we have no doubt that you will discuss our suggestions seriously and thoroughly. You will answer us, not in words, but in class-conscious action.

Workers of Germany Unite

That is the Communist slogan in every factory, every trade union branch, every labour exchange, every labour camp, every workers' quarter. The following facts in the political situation have inspired the Central Committee of the German Communist Party with this call for the formation of a united front:

(1) The swindle of "National-Socialist Revolution" is now apparent. Fifty thousand imprisoned anti-Fascists, ten thousand fugitive fighters in the class war; thousands more crippled from beatings, hundreds assassinated—all these bear bloody witness of how bestially the state of capitalist exploiters is to be defended against proletarian revolution.

(2) A fierce attack on wages, unemployment relief, and incomes has already begun with the margarine ramp, its marriage subsidies, price manipulations, and all tariff and taxation measures—an attack which the bosses have intensified by wage cuts, wage reduction agreements, and partial extension of short time. All wages, relief, unemployment pay, and other sources of income of the working masses of the people are threatened by the inflationary manœuvres of the Hitler-Hugenberg gang.

(3) The whole noisy wireless boosting of the "Four Year Plan of National Reconstruction" has already revealed itself as a shameless deception of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people. Faced with the problem of unemployment the Fascist dictatorship is just as helpless as were Schleicher, Papen, Brüning, Hermann Müller and Cuno. Conscription of the unemployed, pogroms, incitement against Marxists—that is all the Nazi Government has to offer in face of ever-increasing want and misery.

(4) Undisguised militarisation, with marchings, parades, conscription of labour, " military sport," field exercises, and daily civil war against the proletariat ; the whole jingo ramp set going by every state institution, by the schools, the press and the churches—all this in flagrant contradiction to the pacific mouthings of the Hitler Government. Everyone has ceased to believe in the disarmament farce at Geneva. The Four-Power Pact is revealed as an attempt, headed by England, to form a war bloc against the Soviet Union. War threatens Europe. This threat will become a reality if the working class does not raise its iron fist and cry halt.

(5) Hitler has kow-towed to the Allies as have all previous German Governments. He has solemnly engaged himself to the endorsement of the Versailles Treaty, to the policy of fulfilment, to the continued paying of tribute to private foreign creditors. He is the bloodstained overseer, as much of the Versailles, as of the German capitalists.

(6) Two death sentences in Chemnitz, four against communist workers in Hamburg. These are the preliminary steps to the trial of our comrade Thälmann, our comrade Torgler, and the three Bulgarian revolutionaries. These trials are to be used for a vast Nationalist campaign of persecution against Bolshevism, they are to be used as incentives to whip up war feeling against the Soviet Union, and help sharpen the terrorism against every anti-Fascist worker.

Take all these facts together :—theft of unemployment relief, wage cuts, brutal militarisation of the army of unemployed workers, preparation for war in the near future, slavish policy of the fulfilment of the Versailles Treaty, " legal " mass murder as the adjunct of the beatings to death and concentration camps ; and there you have the next steps projected by the Hitler dictatorship. But we must ask ourselves the question : What plans has the working class to frustrate these Fascist intentions ?

" *Let Him Ruin Himself* "

Comrades ! Only those who wish to help Fascism can give such base advice to the workers. Hitler will never " ruin himself." If the workers keep " law and order," if they let themselves be robbed of their wages, if, without resistance, they submit to terrorism and war incitement, it will not mean that Hitler ruins himself, it will mean such a general catastrophe for every worker, peasant, and employed man or woman throughout Germany, as can only end in further imperialist massacre, in war against the Soviet Union.

The bourgeoisie is speculating on a divided working class. It is hoped that working-class divisions will render the workers incapable of resistance. Only such imperialist speculations have given them the courage to hatch out, in conjunction with Herr Hitler, their bestial plans of robbery and war. Already it is an open secret that the great masses of Nazi electors are discontented. State and municipal employees live like serfs. The middle classes in the towns are beginning to murmur, and peasants grow critical of the Third Reich.

But who is equal to the task of inspiring these working masses of the German people, who turned from the Monarchy but were ruined by the Republic, who set their last hopes on Hitler, with the courage necessary to struggle ?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who can direct their anger to an end, lead them to fight the ever-increasing want, the savage repression of every movement for freedom, the threat of war? Only the German working class, which suffers worst under the bloodstained dictatorship of Hitler.

This is the hour for the proletariat to fulfil its historic mission. We are the only class which, as shown by the teachings of Marx and Engels, is capable of leading the oppressed, famished people to freedom and Socialism. So that all must now be set aside which might hinder the workers from taking up their class offensive for the overthrow of Fascist dictatorship. We have no time to lose. We must abolish, resolutely, at once, the reproach of division within ourselves, the fratricidal war of proletarian brother against brother.

We belong to one class, the working class. Facing us is the enemy, the bloodstained Fascist dictatorship of capitalism. One task lies ahead of us—the unification of the workers for a common struggle to crush out capitalist dictatorship. For all these reasons the Central Committee of the German Communist Party propose to you that shoulder to shoulder with the Communists and with all other German workers, you lead the *Socialist Fight for Freedom* against the capitalist offensive, against Fascist terrorism and the danger of imperialist war, for the overthrow of the bloody Hitler Dictatorship.

The Socialist Fight for Freedom—that is the Fight which will Unite the Working Class

Our fight for freedom gives every worker and employee in Germany the signal not to retreat an inch before Fascist aggression, to gather up every force of resistance, use every form of mass struggle, from the smallest protest to the greatest mass demonstration and mass opposition, to smash back, with strikes and mass defence, the aggressive terrorism of the Brown pest which battens on Germany's need, to fight as hard for our class brothers condemned to death in Altona and Chemnitz, for comrades Thälmann and Torgler and all other prisoners, as though each of us were defending his own life, his personal liberty, his own body, against brutality.

A blow of the fist in the grinding mask of Fascist dictatorship, a proletarian right-hander on the fat double chins of wage plunderers and Nazi bosses, a staggering blow against war instigators at home, one mighty action for class solidarity and the defence of our imprisoned class comrades—that shall be the beginning of the Socialist fight for freedom.

"It is impossible to fight with all this Crisis and Terror"

Your own experience contradicts this treacherous lie. Comrades! Whenever some wretched fellow tries to persuade you that the crisis makes struggle impossible, that nothing can be done against terrorism, stop his mouth, don't let him finish! Anyone who tries to tell you this is a lackey of Hitlerism, a capitalist agent. You yourselves know that these are cowardly lies, told to divide you.

Have you forgotten that mighty anti-Fascist action of 1932, in which hundreds of thousands of Communists, Social-Democrats, independent trade unionists, members of the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition, and unorganised workers, stood shoulder to shoulder like a wall? In hundreds of industries the plans of Papen and the bosses for cutting wages were foiled with the weapon of the strike. In the workers' districts of Hamburg and Berlin, Brunswick and Düsseldorf, in the Ruhr area, and in Central Germany mass strikes and armed resistance broke the terror of the National-Socialists.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Workers of the Social-Democratic Party and the A.D.G.B. (the German T.U.C.—Ed. LABOUR MONTHLY), remember how, at a time of acutest crisis and military dictatorship, we sent the monarchy to the devil, by mass struggle and universal strikes. Remember how, by the general strike, we checkmated Kapp and Lüttwitz. Have you forgotten how in the days of inflation, at a time of military seige, we got rid of Cuno? And by now you have certainly understood that Papen was forced to resign because of the hundreds of small and middling strikes and demonstrations by the unemployed, that the mighty strike action of ten thousand Hamburgers and over twenty thousand Berlin transport workers brought his downfall.

Let us therefore have done at once with all professional pessimists and whiners who fear the class struggle worse than Fascist terror, are more scared by the thought of proletarian freedom than of Fascist Dictatorship, whose aim it is to sap the workers' courage, cripple their power to fight, sow division in the proletariat in the interests of Hitler and capitalism.

"Law and order"—the slogan has always been the same. That was the cry of 1789, in 1848, in 1871 at the Paris Commune. It was the cry in 1917 at a time of victorious revolution in Russia; it was the cry in the defeated proletarian revolution of 1918. And this same cry is repeated again to-day.

Struggle is the father of all things. "The whole history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles," says Karl Marx. Therefore we proclaim the unification of the working class on this Marxist basis of the class struggle. There is no other unification of the working class.

[The appeal then proposes five points of struggle which it states could form the first measures for the unification of the struggle, namely immediate assistance for all prisoners of Fascism; the organisation of strikes against the wage robbers and price manipulators; mass struggle against the robbery of unemployment relief and against forced labour; struggle against the threat of imperialist war; and Hands off the Soviet Union. After describing them in detail it then proceeds as below:—(Editor, LABOUR MONTHLY).]

Join Hands as Brothers and Unite for Resolute and Fearless Struggle

Our proposals are in accord with the anti-Fascist appeal for the united front and with the resolutions of the European anti-Fascist workers' Congress which met in Paris at Whitsun. Three thousand anti-Fascist delegates, sent by the workers from factories, trade unions, and the proletarian mass organisations of every country appealed at that Congress for a united struggle, shoulder to shoulder, in fraternal solidarity against Fascism, the capitalist offensive, and war. Just as in Paris Communist and Social-Democratic workers proclaimed the united workers' front against capitalism, so in every works and labour exchange in Germany, anti-Fascist workers must join hands as brothers for a fearless and resolute struggle against the bloody Fascist Dictatorship. Our demands for Socialist action in defence of freedom are no "Party demands." The suggestions we lay before you are the class demands of the German proletariat. These are questions which vitally concern the whole of the German working class. The demands are of supreme international importance for the whole world proletariat.

Once we allow wage cuts and social robbery to be carried through in Germany the capitalist all the world over will make the submissive patience of German workers their excuse for robbing their own workers of the wages and standard of life which they have achieved.

JJ

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If German workers hesitate to attack the Fascist terror relentlessly millions of workers, all the world over, will begin to believe that their united struggle is not, after all, as yet so necessary.

If German workers do not put forth every ounce of strength to resist Fascist warmongering and Fascist armament, the imperialists everywhere will find it easier to whip up their own workers into hostility and readiness for war against Germany, and to turn their minds to the class struggle against their own exploiters and warmongers.

We must not—we shall not let this happen, if once we realise that the eyes of the world proletariat are fixed on Germany. The German working class is the front line of the proletarian fighting front in all capitalist countries. We fight in the front line of the anti-Fascist, anti-capitalist class war.

We must Learn from Our Mistakes

Comrades, you can look back now on all that has happened between August 4, 1914, and January 30, 1933. For twenty years the majority of the German working class has followed the lead of Social-Democracy. And the results of the last two decades of Social-Democracy are: the legal seizure of power by Hitler Fascism with the help of Hindenburg. "Through Democracy to Socialism!" That was one of the wiliest suggestions ever used by capitalism to lead the workers astray, to confuse the minds of millions of proletarians, and split the working class. Now it is time to rid ourselves once and for all of that lie which recent events have exposed for all time.

Democracy: that is to say, August 4, 1914, when the Reichstag section of the German Socialist Party voted the war credits and sang "Deutschland Ueber Alles" with Kaiser Wilhelm.

Democracy: that is to say, Noske and 1918 and his gang of monarchist officers, who now hold leading positions with the Nazis. Rosa Luxemburg and Liebknecht were murdered in the name of democracy. Fifteen thousand workers, revolutionary Marxists, were slaughtered to save the bourgeoisie—the national Assembly, the bourgeois state, the Weimar constitution, and the Versailles plunders treaty, from destruction by the proletarian revolution.

Democracy: that is to say, Severing, who, with the Bielefeld renegades split the Red Army in the Ruhr, disarmed them, and shot them down with a rain of shells; all those officers of the Reichswehr who, in 1923, in Saxony, carried out the orders of Ebert.

Troops, machine guns, class justice for the bourgeoisie; rubber truncheons for the workers, and paper votes—that was democracy under which Social-Democratic ministers and chiefs of police hounded down the revolutionary workers' movement, made possible the first Stahlhelm and Nazi marches under the police protection through the workers' districts, banned the Red Front Fighting League, let anti-war demonstrations be beaten up year after year, arranged a bloody May Day with 33 corpses in Berlin, and repressed numberless strikes with bloodshed.

Democracy: that was the bourgeois soil in which Fascism could sprout and flourish, till the bourgeoisie, from sheer terror of the growing strength of the proletarian revolution, went over to open Fascist dictatorship.

"The State above parties," "we must all make sacrifices for the well-being of the peoples at home," "coalition policy and economic democracy," "bear with the lesser evil"—Comrades, do you not see how wrong you were to follow

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this bourgeois doctrine, which has nothing now in common with Marxism—to listen to these Socialist phrases which cloaked a capitalist policy ?

Democracy has led you to Fascism. The state has proved itself what Marx and Engels showed it to be, the instrument of oppression used by the dominant class to keep down the exploited and plundered classes. Lenin says in *The State and Revolution* that the forms of the bourgeois state are innumerable, but their essence is all the same. All the states in one way or another and in the last analysis are nothing but dictatorships of the bourgeoisie. *Democracy by Ballot Paper*, which, with the conscious intention of splitting the workers, has led the Social-Democratic Party and trade union leaders and officials to the State swill tubs and taught them to wear evening dress and drink champagne is, without doubt, a most refined form of capitalist dictatorship. But that does not change one atom the granite definition of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, who perceived so clearly that it is all still but a dictatorship of the bourgeois. Whoever fought for Weimar fought for capitalism and against the class interests of the proletariat.

Who are the Real Splitters of the Working Class?

Comrades, for twenty years you have believed your trade union leaders and politicians when they told you that the Spartacus League and the Communists were sowing dissension among the workers.

To-day you have learnt to know Communists, and how true they have remained to Marxism and the working class. The real splitters were those who, with Hindenburg and Wilhelm, hounded the workers for four and half years into the mass slaughter of the world war. The real splitters were those who, with Hindenburg and Noske, stifled the revolution of 1918 in blood and disarmed the proletariat ; the real splitters were those who with their coalitions, their economic democracy and arbitration policy have suppressed the revolutionary workers' movement, have throttled strikes, built battleships, and tolerated emergency decrees.

Hermann Müller, Brüning, Papen, Schleicher, Hitler—there is your " lesser evil " now—" who votes for Hindenburg strikes at Hitler ; who votes for Thälmann elects Hitler." Comrades, is there still anyone now who would dare to defend this lie spread far and wide by Social-Democracy against the Communist Party ? Is there still one thinking worker who can assert that the Communists are wrong when they said : " whoever votes for Hindenburg is helping Hitler into the saddle."

Back to Marx—and Forward to Lenin

Comrades, take four facts which must bring a flush of shame to the cheeks of every thinking worker who for five, ten, twenty years, and even longer, has toiled and moiled, and sacrificed for Socialism.

On July 20, 1932, when Severing got cold feet and retired before Papen's bid for power, like the coward he was, we sounded the alarm, and wanted, side by side with you, to proclaim a general strike against the unashamed insolence of Fascism. What was the answer of Social-Democracy and the A.D.G.B. : " Whoever suggests a general strike is a provocative agent and helps Hitler."

On January 30, 1933, when Hindenburg was forming the Hitler Government, our call to fight was answered by the Social-Democrats and the A.D.G.B. with savage incitements against communists. And in the first Reichstag sitting Wels proclaimed that the National Government could take office.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On May first, 1933, when the demagogic Hitler proclaimed our old day of struggle against capitalism a state holiday, the A.D.G.B. publicly and shamelessly summoned all workers to take part, and trade union leaders marched side by side with Hitler, Göring, Göbbels, Hugenberg, Schacht, Siemens, Klöckner and Thyssen. The payment for this they received on May 2.

Then came the Deepest Shame of all

That was the Reichstag of May 17 at which Hitler proclaimed as the chief item on his programme the suppression and wiping out of Marxism and Bolshevism ; the sitting in which he swore his servile oath to maintain the conditions of the Versailles Treaty and pay all the tributary interests ; in which, under a cloak of pacifist phrases, he whipped up every instinct of jingo hatred. While one half of the Social-Democratic Party had been arrested, or were flying for their lives from the Nazis, or else had failed to attend for fear of Göring, the other half voted " to a man " for the Nazi Government, endorsed its programme, sang the Deutschland song with Hitler, and stood respectfully at attention to listen to the Hörst Wessel anthem, while a few days later Löbe openly declared that these votes had not been got by fear or force, but were given from " deep inward conviction."

Comrades of Social-Democracy ! Is it possible for Marx and Engels, could anyone even in his most secret thoughts, have felt sympathy for that sort of murderous carrion ? The very question is deeply insulting to the great masters of Marxism. Can you gauge from this how low Social-Democracy and the A.D.G.B. leaders have sunk ?

Only a party whose theoreticians, thirty years ago, had begun to deny the Marxist thesis of increasing misery and, with Bernstein's theory, to glorify capitalism, could have fallen to such depths of degradation ; a party whose parliamentary deputies became reconciled twenty-five years ago with the colonial policy of German imperialism ; a party which had begun to " go to court," and whose leaders, twenty years ago, betrayed the Marxist International in the world war ; a party whose parliamentary deputies swore a life and death pact in 1918 with the bourgeoisie against the revolution, whose ministers, for fifteen years, falsified and slandered Marxism, betrayed the class war, denied the Marxist theory of the state, disarmed the proletariat, and split the working class.

Make an end of this bourgeois swindle foisted on you by Bernstein, Kautsky, Hilferding, Leipart, Arno, Löbe and Wels. Have done, once and for all, with Weimar democracy, the black-red-yellow flag, toleration, " the lesser evil." Back to the class war, to the flag of the proletarian revolution—*back to Marx !*

But Marxism to-day, the living Marxism, is Leninism. Just 30 years ago Lenin purged the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party of all its middle class " theorists " and " leaders " who, in Russia, also did their best to slander and distort the teachings of Marx. While the German leaders of Social-Democracy were raising their hue and cry against the Russian " itch for argument," against bolshevik dividers, Lenin, unmoved by the clamour of the Populists and Revisionists, created that iron party of the Bolsheviks which crushed out of existence the worst reaction in the world—Tzarism—and set up the proletarian dictatorship, triumphant over a sixth of the earth ; the party which, under the most difficult conditions, can assert the power of the proletarian state ; which has worked out its mighty theory and practice of proletarian dictatorship, which demonstrates by its Socialist planned economy, how

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalism can finally be extirpated ; which wages untiring war on unemployment, which builds up new industries, develops the Socialist culture which, with the power of the proletarian state, shows how Fascism may be routed out once and for all ; which, by arming its peasants and workers, has given us a living example of how imperialist treaties of enslavement can be torn up, the warmongers of the capitalist world held in check. Therefore, forward to Lenin !

Forward to the Workers' and Peasants' Republic and no returning to Weimar

We are certain Marxism and Leninism will triumph over Fascist phrase-mongering. We know that Fascist dictatorship does not express the strength and stability of the capitalist system, the power of the bourgeoisie. The Nazi dictatorship is a desperate effort of the German robber social order to save itself from intensifying crisis and growing indignation, from the imminent threat of proletarian revolution.

Comrades of Social-Democracy, think of Lenin's words : " In Russia it was easier to conquer political power, but it is a hard and complex task to enforce it in this agrarian country." In Germany it is hard to conquer political power, but it will be easy to hold, once we have it. Thousands of factories are waiting unused, at a standstill. We shall not need to build them, as they have had to do in the Soviet Union. Millions of skilled workers here are crying out for work. We have them and shall not need to train them through years of difficult effort. Lack of purchasing power, intermittent production, over-production—these are the typical problems of the capitalist system, unknown to Socialist planned economy. What did Litvinov say at the World Economic Conference in London ? " that the Soviet Union could import at once to the value of 35 milliards of marks, provided the difficulties of the capitalist system of private profit did not impede the exchange of goods."

We have no fear of lack of work. The Soviet Union alone could give our German Socialist-planned economy full time work for years ahead. There is only one way out of the world crisis which can be for the good of the proletariat, and of all German rural and urban workers, and that is Socialism ; it is the German Workers' and Peasants' Republic.

Different as are the conditions in every country, the chief road to the victory of Socialism in all capitalist countries is the same. This road lies through struggle, strikes, mass strikes, a general strike, and the conquest of political power by the proletariat, in an offensive alliance with the peasants and toilers of the town. The aim of the revolutionary class struggle is not bourgeois democracy with benefits for Social-Democratic politicians, coalitions and a policy of toleration, ending in Fascism or white military dictatorship. The aim which Marx revealed as in the Paris Commune, which Lenin worked out as a task of his whole life, a task to which 160,000,000 workers and peasants bear a living witness—that aim is :

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Whoever is against the dictatorship of the proletariat is *for* the dictatorship of capital. There is no other alternative. Whoever rejects this aim is no Marxist. Whoever fights against us supports capitalism, helps Fascism.

What did Italy teach ? When the Italian Social-Democrats found themselves confronted with the choice of fighting side by side with Communists for proletarian revolution and dictatorship, or of helping the bourgeoisie to down

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the workers, their whole previous policy left them no choice. What did they do? They throttled strikes, hindered demonstrations, fought Communists, smoothed out the way for Mussolini.

What did Poland teach? When the proletarian revolution had ripened and Pilsudski brought off his Fascist *coup d'état*, the Polish Social-Democrats welcomed him as their saviour. And to this very day these same Polish Social-Democrats are organising strike-breakers and are intensifying the split in the Polish working class.

And in Germany! Comrades, the heads of your party have been allied for twenty years with Hindenburg. It is fifteen years now since Noske, Severing and Hörsing themselves organised the frontier guards and freebooting corps which later were used for political murders and which bred Nazi leaders of the type of Killinger and Heine. For ten years Social-Democratic Chiefs of the Police and Ministers have allowed Nazi and Stahlhelm formations free access to the workers' districts. But Social-Democratic leaders themselves cry out for a "firm hand" over the trade unions.

They are all realists now. They endorse Hitler's foreign policy, and will vote him war credits to any amount. They are in full agreement with his repression of Communists and Bolshevists—they themselves did the same thing just as brutally. They will vote him civil war credits to any amount.

Don't Submit to any New Trickery

Comrades, don't let yourselves be blinded. The same Wels who had already resigned from the bureau of the Second International declares now from the safety of Prague and his new Party headquarters that he remains a member of the Executive Bureau of this League of Nations institution.

The same Löbe who "from deep conviction" voted for Hitler and sang patriotic hymns at Hitler's side, denounces Wels as a coward while he himself brags of his courage and crows: "The Party headquarters of Social-Democracy must remain here in Germany." But the little birds are saying on the house-tops that Löbe has arranged all this with Göring because the Brown House wants Social-Democratic headquarters to be always ready for use in the case of emergency; since the Nazis might want at any minute to stage new mass deceptions, new "people's-community" farces, of the kind they produced so successfully on May 1st and on May 17 in the Reichstag.

Several people who speculate on your stupidity, who fear your mass indignation, and still go in terror of the unification of the working class on the basis of the class struggle, are beginning again to use left-ist catchwords to keep you round the captured flag. Crispien has just stood up, and at last begun to discover that democracy was no more than a bourgeois device. And this esteemed member of the Second International wants to make you believe that for a long time now he "had been at heart in disagreement" with the policy of Wels and Leipart.

Others again come to you and say: "There is no point in the day-to-day struggle, we must wait for the great day of the general strike and the general settlement of accounts," and then, of course, they will fight magnificently against Fascism. Comrades, all this sounds very radical, and yet it is only an impudent attempt to maintain and intensify this split in the working class. It is all done to dope you, to keep you from the day-to-day struggle, to build up a wall between the Communists and Social-Democrats.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This question confronts you to-day ; will you sink deeper and deeper into the slough of " people's community "—Nationalism, Fascism, and war ; will you, passively and of your own free will, let yourselves be thrust further and further into the mire and horror of crisis, price raising, and inflation, or do you realise now :

That there is only one anti-Fascist, anti-capitalist party, only one Marxist, only one Socialist Party—the Communist Party.

That there is only one Marxist, Socialist, class-conscious International—the Communist, the Third, International.

We call to you, comrades, in the name of that responsibility which you Social-Democratic workers bear before the German working class and the working class of the whole world. We say to you : " The time is come when you must have courage to look unpleasant truths straight in the face, when you must summon up courage to choose, to turn aside from the wrong path, to move straight on to the end of the road, join up your ranks with us and march on to Socialism and Freedom.

No new groups, no new divisions and sub-divisions, can help us to-day. The old split must be healed at once. To-day there is only one question anywhere for discussion in our orders of the day—the unification, for struggle, of the working class.

To-day there is only one task—to concentrate our joint strength against a common enemy. To-day we must have clear thinking. We must be certain to whom we belong. We are workers. We are to be sweated in every trade. We stand with empty bellies outside the exchanges.

We Communists know—you, too, want revolution—you, too, want Socialism. Over two years ago our imprisoned leader, Ernst Thälmann, in a monster demonstration of more than ten thousand workers in the vast Sports Palace in Berlin gave us the slogan : " Our hands in brotherhood to the Social-Democratic worker."

We offer you our hands in brotherhood. Comrades—shake !

Let us make an end, once and for all, of the policy which led to January 30.

The General Committee urges all Communist workers to get into instant touch with all Social-Democratic workers, to discuss measures for the common fight and begin, without delay, the Socialist struggle for freedom.

The Central Committee urges all Social-Democratic workers to get into instant touch with their Communist comrades. Don't lose time waiting ! Organise the mighty struggle !

The Central Committee appeals to the whole German working class to show itself worthy of the tradition of Marx and Engels, to show that Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and tens of thousands other slaughtered workers did not die in vain, to show that the German working class knows how to learn from its own experience and from the magnificent policy of Bolshevik Russia.

Comrades set to work ! We know the way and we know the aim. Our slogans are : *With us for the Socialist Fight for Freedom ! Join up with the Communist Party of Germany ! Long Live the Soviet Union ! The Third International will Free the World !* (*Signed*) Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany (Section of the Third International).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AND COMMUNISM

By L. RUDAS

[*With this month is printed a contribution drawing together the Discussion of Dialectical Materialism which has been proceeding in the* LABOUR MONTHLY[1] *since the May issue, in the form of a reply to E. F. Carritt by L. Rudas, of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute.*]

SINCE the time of Huxley, materialism has not been discussed in England; it was officially considered to be dead. The "victory" of reactionary philosophy over materialism at that time was achieved without very great difficulty. Even Huxley himself could not summon up the courage to be a thorough-going materialist or openly to proclaim his adherence to materialism; he preferred, under the pressure of "public opinion," to seek a way out through the "shamefaced materialism" of agnosticism. Nor were there in England other adherents of materialist philosophy who could have made a resolute defence of the latter. Even the "Socialists" were anything but materialists. Engels indeed wrote a special preface to his pamphlet on "The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science," particularly intended for the British working class, in which he laid bare the causes why the British ruling class gave itself up to idealism and religion and in which he called upon the British proletariat to return to the glorious traditions of English materialism. Engels' words, however, had to remain without effect so long as there was no revolutionary working class party in England which could take up the struggle decisively against both the old economic order and its *conception of the world*, and proclaim openly and fearlessly its adherence to dialectical materialism.

At the present time, materialism finds a determined and logical champion in England, as in the other parts of the world where the Communist movement is carrying on the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. This has essentially altered the fighting front in the struggle of idealism against materialism, especially since in the Soviet Union, *i.e.*, in one of the largest and most powerful states of the world, dialectical materialism exercises not only unrestricted theoretical dominance but also celebrates new triumphs every day in the practical construction of

[1] See May and June, Nos. 5 and 6, pp. 324-329, 383-391, for E. F. Carritt's article.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialism. On the other hand, in the capitalist world, the official triumph of idealist philosophy becomes converted into a very palpable defeat; not only is capitalism writhing in the most horrible world crisis, which makes its instability obvious to all, but bourgeois ideology along with idealist philosophy more and more throws off the surface appearance of scientific character and reveals itself without disguise for that which in basis it always was, viz., reactionary mysticism which always fears and *hinders* the progress of science.

Under these circumstances it is no wonder that individual thinkers, who are beginning to be tired of capitalism and its reactionary ideology and whose attention has been drawn by the revolutionary Communist movement to the possibility of a higher economic and social order, should adopt a sympathetic attitude to Communism and also begin to take its ideology, dialectical materialism, into consideration.

It is, however, one thing to sympathise with Communism and another thing to *fight* for Communism in the ranks of the Party of the revolutionary proletariat. It is one thing to be tired of idealism and sympathetic towards materialism and another thing to *understand* the latter. But these two things are very closely connected. The pre-requisite for understanding dialectical materialism is a decisive break with the traditional mode of thought, the *revolutionising of thinking*, and also sooner or later enrolment in the ranks of the revolutionary Party.

The intellectual, who does not come to the theory of dialectical materialism by way of revolutionary practice but from the ordinary school philosophies, looks for a " System " of dialectical materialism. He is accustomed to study philosophical systems, Kantianism, Hegelianism, &c. Marxism-Leninism is for him also a " system " alongside of the others. " Where," he asks, " have Marx and Lenin given an exposition of their ' system ' ; show it to me so that I can study it. I find only ' scattered pronouncements ' in Marx." To a Russian bourgeois sociologist, who asked the same question, Lenin replied with a counter-question, " Where has Marx *not* expounded dialectical materialism ? " *Dialectical materialism is no " system,"* and whoever seeks such a " system " in Marx, Engels or Lenin, will seek in vain. A " system " is always something finite, limited, transitory, a too narrow framework for the infinite dialectical movement of the world, and even in the case of the great philosophies it was always their " system " which most quickly became out of date; what remained of them was always the dialectical content which was often hidden in their work in spite of the " system."

There is not a single work of Marx, Engels, Lenin or Stalin, there is not a single real step taken by the revolutionary movement, in which one cannot study dialectical materialism. And indeed it is here alone that it can be studied and must be studied. That is not to say that dialectical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

materialism cannot or ought not to be specially expounded because it is, as Mr. Carritt considers, a " Protean theory." It has already been classically expounded by Engels and Lenin—even if in polemic against hostile philosophical tendencies. Whoever, however, wants to understand dialectical materialism must study the *whole* of Marxism-Leninism and then combine this theoretical study with practical participation in the revolutionary proletarian movement. Materialist dialectics is a revolutionary theory and not an abstract philosophising. It is not a new interpretation of the world, for it involves the transformation of the world.

This close connection of materialist dialectics with revolutionary practice is bound up with another difficulty encountered by the intellectual in the study of dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism is only recognised and expounded by Marxist revolutionaries. Official philosophy takes no notice of it and not even the names of Marx and Engels are mentioned in any philosophical text books. The really great revolutionary geniuses were, in the first place, Marx, Engels and Lenin—they expounded dialectical materialism in truly *adequate* fashion. Plekhanov and even Bukharin were not in a position to give an unexceptionable exposition of dialectical materialism, in the last resort also because they did not have an unexceptionable line in politics. Plekhanov finally betrayed the revolution, Bukharin fell into opportunism. If now Mr. Carritt reproaches us with recognising only the expositions of Marx, Engels and Lenin as unexceptionable and that we " swear by the word of the master " (Mr. Carritt even puts it in Latin : *ipsi dixerunt*) and comes to the conclusion that Communists suffer from a narrow dogmatism, then every sensible man will see that in the above state of affairs, Communists could not behave otherwise without doing the greatest damage to the revolutionary movement by blunting precisely the sharpest weapon of revolutionary struggle.

The *revolutionary essence* of dialectical materialism, its unity with the revolutionary movement of the modern proletariat, is however, *in every respect*, the key to the understanding of this theory. It is not for nothing that Marx, as already mentioned, laid the greatest emphasis on this in his " *Theses on Feuerbach.*" But it is just this which in the long run prevents Mr. Carritt, in spite of all good will, from correctly appreciating our philosophy. He does not understand why dialectical materialism and Communism must be connected. He says :

> Finding myself in sympathy with the objective of Communists (though not usually with their strategy and tactics), I am disturbed to hear, both from many Communists and from many of their bitterest opponents, that Communism is inseparable from a philosophy which I find hard to understand and, so far as I understand it, impossible on philosophical grounds to accept. This article is an attempt to get clear what I understand that philosophy to be, my difficulties in accepting it and my reasons for thinking that it has no necessary connection with the economic or social doctrines of Communism. (p. 324).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In another place he expresses himself still " more provocatively " :

> Dialectical materialism looks like vitalism applied to physics and to society as well as to life. . . . It applies a vitalist method outside biology. But this solution is not satisfactory. And if Marxists could achieve, as of course they cannot, that there should be no Communists who did not believe this solution as it stands (intelligently believe of course), they might as well tie a millstone round the neck of Communism and throw it overboard. Nor do I see any reason why anybody who accepted the solution should accept Communism. (p. 391).

And finally, we have the following :

> From Engels' notes for *Dialektik u. Natur*, it is clear that he founded dialectics on two facts mainly : (1) the transformation of motion into heat, light, electricity ; (2) the evolution of species. What these have to do with Communism I cannot, after patient effort, understand. He admits that his science may grow " out of date," *i.e.*, you cannot predict by dialectic in science. Why, then, in politics ? If dialectic cannot tell what heat will turn into till science has discovered, it cannot tell what capitalism will turn into till empirical economic and social sciences discover that. We may think, they have done so ; if so, dialectic can be discarded. (p. 327).

I have quoted all the places in which Mr. Carritt tries to prove that dialectical materialism and Communism are not necessarily connected with one another I have done so, not only in order to do justice to the arguments of the author, but also in order to show the reader that for him there is a real difficulty here. However, the difficulty is naturally an imaginary one. Let us review the arguments of the author one by one, (even though not quite in the same order as given by him).

What is Communism ? It is the revolutionary movement of the working class, its organised struggle against capitalism and against the capitalist class ; it is *class struggle*. And what is the class struggle ? It is the consequence of the *contradiction* between the social productive forces of present day society and the productive relations in the latter. That is to say, Communism is the result of the *dialectical contradiction* inside capitalist society between the productive forces and the productive relations. The economic and social theory of Marxism-Leninism reveals this contradiction. But the economic and social theory of Marx is based on the *dialectical method*. The social contradiction of which we have spoken is indeed only a special case of the general dialectical law that development proceeds by contradictions and in the struggle of opposites. Everyone who merely casts a glance at Marx's works can see that without the dialectical method the Marxist economic and social theory is simply unthinkable. Compare bourgeois economy and " social theory " with that of Marxism-Leninism. The former is neither materialist nor dialectical. What can *it* predict ? For it bourgeois society is something eternally present, it does not develop but always remains capitalism. On the other hand, Marx, by the aid of the dialectical method, predicted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost a century ago the proletarian dictatorship, which to-day has become a reality. In our epoch, in which what Marx predicted by the aid of the dialectical method has been verified almost word for word, where the Communist Party is the only Party which can truly forecast the course of events of capitalist society and which predicts and also realises the inevitable social revolution, which it is able to do thanks to dialectical materialism, it is incomprehensible to me for anyone to say that nothing can be predicted in politics with the help of dialectics. With the continual application of the dialectical method, the Soviet Union is celebrating one triumph after another in the construction of Socialism. The plan, according to which the construction is carried on, is laid down on the basis of the dialectical method. Under these circumstances, how can anyone say that dialectics cannot foretell anything and is superfluous ?

Mr. Carritt regards dialectics as superfluous because in each separate case the nature of the contradiction and its cause, &c., has to be specially investigated, because, that is to say, dialectics is not a formula, which can be applied to every case without further investigation. But is this not the case with all other general laws ? Take the law of the conservation and transformation of energy. Is this law a formula, which makes the investigation of particular cases unnecessary ? Can I, for example, on the basis of the general law, predict how concretely heat is converted into electricity ? Or how energy is conserved on the collision of an electron with a light photon ? Nevertheless, this law is one of the most important in natural science, governing all individual cases. The revolution in science during the recent period has not even touched this law. And if natural scientists were to be conscious that this law is a *dialectical law*, they would spare themselves many errors.

The case is not different with dialectics. It is a still more general law than that of the conservation of energy, which latter is only a physical special case of general dialectics. It is for this reason that Engels paid so much attention to it in his *Naturdialektik*. Similarly, the transformation of species is a special case of dialectics in biology. But it is an error to believe that Engels based dialectics on these two facts and to conclude from that, that because these two facts are not immediately connected with Communism, therefore dialectics in general has nothing to do with the latter. In *nature*, these two facts are the most important (but by no means the sole) phenomena of general dialectics, but Engels does not base dialectics on nature alone but also on *history*. And the question whether society develops dialectically has surely something to do with Communism.

In short, without dialectics there can be no scientific picture of the world, without dialectics the separate sciences are condemned to groping

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the dark, without dialectics there is no correct method for investigation of an individual case or a single region. Still less is it possible for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat to exist without materialist dialectics. The dialectical method is the sharpest weapon of this revolutionary struggle, it leads the way to action. It is dialectics which reveals for us the laws of development of present day society, which shows that the goal for which we are fighting is furthered by the objective dialectics of society. How then can dialectical materialism and Communism not be in the closest connection ? Communism is a revolutionary movement, which arises and grows on the basis of social development. It is the product of social dialectics. Dialectical materialism, for its part, is the consciousness, the reflection of this objective dialectics in the heads of the members of the vanguard of the revolution, the Communists. How can the objective movement and the consciousness of it not be inseparably connected ? Can one conduct a fight *correctly* with incorrect consciousness ? And how could a non-Communist be a dialectical materialist ? For dialectical materialism means recognition of the social revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the concrete solution of the social contradictions. Only one who recognises this revolution will also recognise its theoretical foundation and, *vice-versa*, one who is a dialectical materialist will and must become a Communist for he must draw the practical consequences from his theoretical conviction. If he does not do so, then he is not a dialectical materialist.

Therefore, if Mr. Carritt sympathises with the aim of the Communists but not with their strategy and tactics, that implies a grievous misunderstanding of the relation of the aim and of the strategy and tactics among the Communists. He desires the aim but not the path which leads to it. He forcibly separates the dialectics of social development from the dialectics of the struggle for the social revolution. We do not contend that Communists cannot make mistakes. Mistakes are inevitable precisely because dialectics is not a formula which can be applied mechanically without thinking. We speak of strategy and tactics, which Marx, Engels and Lenin have bequeathed to us, which under Lenin's leadership led to the victory of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and which, under Stalin's leadership, is daily bringing new victories. The strategy of British Communists is the strategy of Marxism-Leninism. British Communists strive for the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat just as all Communists in all countries of the globe. But whoever wants Communism *without* the social revolution and *without* proletarian dictatorship, whoever rejects the strategy of the Communists,—his sympathy with Communism may be the expression of dissatisfaction with the existing social order, but it can be nothing more. From that to conscious struggle for the better economic order there is still a long way, a way which few go to the end.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be objected here that, granted that the recognition of the dialectics of society is inseparable from Communism, yet dialectical materialism is more than this, it is a philosophy which one can reject or partially accept without ceasing to be a Communist. It is easy to see that this objection does not hold water. The dialectics of society is only a special case of the *general dialectics* of the world, since society, in the last resort, is also part of nature and has developed from nature. Whoever does not recognise the dialectics of nature, cannot recognise, without illogicality, the dialectics of society either. He who denies the dialectics of thinking, and therefore, for example, does not recognise that our knowledge is a reflection of the objective dialectics of the world, he who contests the possibility of knowing the world, &c., how can he be a fighter for the alteration of the world ? In short, without the dialectical conception of the world, it is impossible to be a Communist. Dialectical materialism is cast from one mould, it is a strictly monistic theory, it leaves no loophole for unscientific, religious conceptions, &c. And every undialectical conception cannot help being unscientific ! Dialectical materialism cannot be split into pieces and one part accepted and another rejected without the person doing so ceasing to be a dialectical materialist and a communist.

Mr. Carritt concedes that he partly does not understand dialectical materialism, and insofar as he does understand it, he does not accept it on philosophical grounds. The greatest source of offence for him is the *concept of development* of dialectics, and, in the second place, what he likes to call the " vitalism " of Engels. The former he characterises as a hidden teleology, which he even declares to be inevitable if one desires to prove the inevitability of the Communist economic order with the help of dialectics. He declares :

> Such certainty of progress (as we find expressed by Engels, L. R.), would seem hard to establish empirically for a materialism, which professes to detest teleology. Yet on the other hand it seems indispensable, if we are to prove from dialectic that capitalism must result in Communism rather than in chaos. (p. 328).

That nature and society have developed *up to the present* is an *incontestable fact.* Has our solar system developed from some relatively primitive condition or not ? Has the earth developed ? Has life on the earth developed ? Have organic beings developed up to mankind, have human societies developed ? Except for a philosophical reactionary, these questions must be answered in accordance with scientific knowledge in the affirmative. Development is a fact which is recognised in every separate scientific sphere, and dialectics only *generalises* these separate views to a total view, to a *theory of development*, which not only gives the fact of development but also seeks to explain the *how* of development, the *origin of the new.* Dialectics sees the motive of development in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the struggle of contradictions, in the splitting of the one and in the struggle of its contradictory parts.

> Two fundamental . . . conceptions of development (evolution) are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition; and development as a unity of opposites (the division of the one into mutually exclusive opposites and their reciprocal correlation).
>
> The first conception is dead, poor and dry: the second is vital. It is only this second conception which offers the key to understanding the "self-movement" of everything in existence; it alone offers the key to understanding "leaps," to the "interruption of gradual succession, to the destruction of the old and the appearance of the new." (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XIII. English edition, p. 323-4.)

Mr. Carritt calls this conception of the origin of the new (*e.g.*, of life from dead matter) through the dialectical struggle of opposites, "mere juxtaposition" and he demands "a higher synthesis." We will show later that when dialectical materialism fulfils this demand, then it is accused by Mr. Carritt of vitalism. Just now we desire to draw the attention of the reader to another side of the question. On the one hand materialist dialectics maintains "the unending ascent from lower to higher" (Engels). At the same time it recognises decline, the backward development of all which has developed, retrogression. Indeed, the recognition of retrogression is not less important for materialist dialectics than the recognition of development, for on the transitoriness of social structures is based for example the struggle of the Communists against capitalists. Materialist dialectics, says Marx:

> Includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form, as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary. (*Capital*, Vol. I., Kerr edition, 1912. Preface to 2nd German edition, p. 28.)

Mr. Carritt does not see how the two assertions of general development and of retrogression are compatible with one another. I must confess that I do not understand the difficulty. The downfall of everything that exists is an equally scientifically established fact as evolution itself. Solar systems arise and pass away. Life on the earth arises and passes away as soon as the conditions for it become impossible. Human societies pass away after they have become fully developed. *But what passes away at one point of the universe, develops anew at another.* Our solar system passes away, new ones develop. Life passes away from the earth, it arises elsewhere anew. *In this sense* dialectical materialism asserts an eternal development; what exists evolves. It evolves because the dialectical self-movement of every thing which exists is a driving force

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

towards development. *Decay holds in general for every special case, the endlessness of development holds only for the infinite universe, sub specie aeternitatis* (*in the form of eternity*).

There is not the slightest trace of " teleology " in this. Dialectical materialism conducts the sharpest possible struggle against transferring the source of development to something outside (God or the Subject, *e.g.*, the Absolute Idea of Hegel), which is precisely teleology. On the contrary, it comprehends movement, development as *self-movement* (see the quotation from Lenin cited above).

Then Communism is also transitory, Mr. Carritt will exclaim. Naturally it is, since human society is itself transitory. But we are a long way off from that at present and the question is not worth discussing. Let us first fight for Communism, the rest will follow. It will have quite a time for development. Mr. Carritt objects : " How do you know that capitalism must be followed by Communism and not by chaos ? It cannot be proved by dialectics, at least not without teleology ! "

The dialectical concept of development holds equally for nature and society. Experience has shown that capitalism has developed from feudalism. Experience has also shown that capitalism has developed further to imperialism. That capitalism develops to Socialism (*i.e.*, the first phase of Communism) is shown again by the development in the Soviet Union. Therefore, it has already been shown purely empirically that capitalism is followed not by chaos but by Communism. But Communism in the Soviet Union is not a result of chance, but the conscious work of the proletariat. It is the result of the struggle for Communism as the goal which was envisaged beforehand by the fighting proletariat. The struggle for Communism was, and remains, an historic task, which grows on the basis of knowledge of social development. And where does this knowledge come from ? From materialist dialectics. It is this which reveals the dialectical contradiction between productive forces and productive relations, which lays bare the laws of the self-movement of society, the antagonism of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and its class struggle, and at the same time points out in the proletariat the power which solves the social contradiction by the bringing about of Communism. Human society is still a long way from the point when its downfall must begin. On the contrary, the development of the productive forces of society has, for the first time, reached the point where the real history of mankind begins. Everything up to the present was only the pre-history of mankind. Human society is still evolving, it is not yet in retrogression. Because, as we have said, the inner laws of capitalist society also call into being the class which opens the way for this inevitable development, therefore the whole " problem " which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Carritt puts forward as insoluble is nothing but—a misunderstanding. Dialectics not only points out to the proletariat its historical task, but it gives the proletariat the certainty of victory, it is to a certain extent *the guarantees of this victory.*

(*To be concluded.*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARX AND ENGELS ON THE BRITISH WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

1879—1895

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

In the present period of developing revolutionary struggle it is of the utmost importance that the working class of all countries, Britain not excluded, should know and understand the truth about their own past history. Owing to its relative backwardness in this regard the British working class is under a special obligation to study its past, but with only very few recent exceptions its historians have been at pains to foster certain illusions concerning the nature of that past, and have been especially anxious to demonstrate its peculiarity, its freedom from "doctrinnaire Marxism," its difference from that of all other working-class movements. Whilst paying lip-tribute to the unique position of Marx and Engels as the theoreticians and intellectual leaders of the Continental Socialist movements, we have been "educated" into believing that we in England have been able to manage quite well without their help, and indeed that we are better off without them. Meantime, the publication of the great mass of letters written by Marx and Engels provides a remarkable volume of historical and theoretical material on the development of the workers' movement in Britain. To this material historians of the British working class have consistently turned blind eyes, although, or perhaps just because it supplies overwhelming proof that Marx and Engels played a far more influential part in the British workers' and socialist movement than is commonly conceded. Not only that, but it demonstrates irrefutably that the two great leaders of international socialism consistently put forward a definite course of strategy and policy for the English workers, and that the British movement has gone astray precisely because of its failure to pursue that strategy and policy as well as to understand Marxist theory.

The series of extracts which the LABOUR MONTHLY will publish in this and following issues covers only the last four of Marx's and the last fifteen years of Engels' life, from 1879 to 1895. But those fifteen years saw the genesis of the modern British socialist movement. The Social-Democratic Federation was founded in 1881, the Fabian Society in 1884,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the original Socialist League in the same year, the Independent Labour Party in 1893. The Labour Party came into existence only in 1900, but by 1886 the movement towards a mass labour organisation was taking shape and gaining impetus. In the industrial field it was the period of the rise of the "New Unions," the struggle to organise the unskilled workers and to secure their fair share of representation in the Trades Union Congress and elsewhere. During all these years Engels lived in London, and as the extracts reveal, played an active and highly influential part in the development of the young political movement.

From study of the extracts two main conclusions have to be drawn. First, that the bourgeois and reformist historians have grossly ignored the part Engels and those with him played in almost every struggle and tendency of importance during this period; secondly, Engels' extraordinary acute perception of the basic needs of the socialist movement in Britain, his anticipation of the wilderness of error and confusion through which that movement was to wander, and his clear-sighted judgment of individuals and parties. To all without exception he applied the acid test of the principles and experience he and Marx had formulated and accumulated during forty years' active participation in working-class movements, and his whole-hearted condemnation of certain individuals and parties, as also his estimate of the requisites for building up a sound workers' movement in Britain, have been abundantly justified and proved especially during the last twenty years. Belatedly, nearly forty years after Engels' death, the British workers have an opportunity of learning the truth about their past and of profiting by the mistakes of their forerunners. From these extracts they may learn that the path of revolutionary struggle and the need for a revolutionary workers' movement are as inevitable and as necessary to-day as they were in Engels' time.

The first group of extracts, printed below, covers the five year period from 1879, before the emergence of political organisations claiming to represent the interests of the workers, down to 1884, on the eve of the split inside the Social Democratic Federation which led to the formation of the Socialist League.

H. C. S.

I.

IN reply to your letter of the 13th received only yesterday, I regret that I must inform you that I cannot give you the name of anyone who is really in a position to write the articles as they would need to be.

For many years the English working-class movement has been hopelessly revolving in a narrow round of strike struggle for higher wages

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and shorter hours, and these strikes are regarded not as a temporary measure and not as a means of propaganda and organisation, but as a final aim. On the basis of their rules, the trade unions even exclude in principle any kind of political activity, and consequently participation in any general activity of the working class as a class. In politics the workers are divided into conservatives and Liberal-Radicals, into supporters of Disraeli's Ministry and supporters of Gladstone's Ministry. Consequently one can speak of a working-class movement in England only in so far as strikes take place here, which, whether successful or not, cannot advance the movement a single step. When such strikes, which moreover, owing to the stagnation in business have often been deliberately provoked by the capitalists themselves in search of an excuse for closing down their factories—strikes in which the working class make no progress whatever—are exaggerated into the dimensions of a universal historical struggle, as the "Freiheit"[1] does for example, that in my opinion can only do injury. We must not ignore the circumstance that a genuine workers' movement in the continental sense of the word does not exist here at the present moment; so I think you will lose nothing if for the present you do not receive reports on the activities of the British Trade Unions.—Engels to E. Bernstein,[2] London, June 17, 1879.

The English have recently begun to occupy themselves more with "Capital," &c. Thus in the last October (or November, I am not quite sure) number of the *Contemporary*[3] there is an article on Socialism by John Rae. Very inadequate, full of mistakes, but "fair" as one of my English friends told me the day before yesterday. And why fair? Because* John Rae does *not suppose* that for the forty years I am spreading my pernicious theories, I was being instigated by "bad" motives. "*Seine Grossmuth muss ich loben.*"[4] The fairness of making yourself at least sufficiently acquainted with the subject of your criticism seems a thing quite unknown to the penmen of British philistinism.

Before this, in the beginning of June, there was published by a certain Hyndman[5] (who had before intruded himself into my house), a little

[1] *Freiheit* (1879-1906). A German weekly journal, originally Social Democratic in tendency, but from 1880 onwards the organ of the Anarchists, edited by Johann Most.

[2] Bernstein, Edouard (1850-1932) Leader of German Social Democracy, editor from 1880 of *Sozial-Demokrat*, strongly under Engels' influence until the latter's death in 1895, but began to trend towards reformism, and after Engels' death became an open revisionist.

[3] *The Contemporary Review*, October, 1881. Article, "The Socialism of Karl Marx and the Young Hegelians," by John Rae. John Rae was a journalist and writer on social subjects, author of *Contemporary Socialism* (1884).

* From here onwards the letter was written in English.

[4] "I must praise his magnanimity."

[5] Hyndman, Henry Mayers (1842-1921), "founder of British Socialism" (vide *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 14th ed.). Leader of Social Democratic Federation; Editor of *Justice*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

book : " England for all." It pretends to be written as an exposé of the programme of the " Democratic Federation "[6]—a recently formed association of different English and Scotch radical societies, half bourgeois, half proletaires. The chapters on Labour and Capital are only literal extracts from, or circumlocutions of, the " Capital," but the fellow does neither quote the book, nor its author, but to shield himself from exposure remarks at the end of his preface : " For the ideas and much of the matter contained in Chapters II. and III. I am indebted to the work of a great thinker and original writer, &c., &c." Vis-a-vis myself, the fellow wrote stupid letters of excuse, for instance, that " the English don't like to be taught by foreigners," that " my name was so much detested, &c." With all that his little book—so far as it pilfers the " Capital "—makes good propaganda, although the man is a " weak " vessel, and very far from having even the patience—the first condition of learning anything—of studying a matter thoroughly. All those amiable middle-class writers —if not specialists—have an itching to make money or name or political capital *immediately* out of any new thoughts they may have got at by any favourable windfall. Many evenings this fellow has pilfered from me, in order—to take me out and to learn in the easiest way.

Lastly there was published on December 1 last (I shall send you a copy of it) in the Monthly Review : *Modern Thought*[7] an article : *Leaders of Modern Thought :* No. XXIII.—*Karl Marx*, by *Ernest Belfort Bax*.[8]

Now this is the first English publication of the kind which is pervaded by a real enthusiasm for the new ideas themselves and boldly stands up against Brit. Philistinism. That does not prevent that the biographical notices the author gives of me are mostly wrong, &c. In the exposition of my economic principles and in his translations (*i.e.*, quotations of the " Capital ") much is wrong and confused, but with all that the appearance of this article, announced in large letters by placards on the walls of West End London, has produced a great sensation. What was most important for me, I received the said number of *Modern Thought* already on November 30, so that my dear wife had the last days of her life still cheered up. You know the passionate interest she took in all such affairs.—Marx to Sorge,[9] December 15, 1881.

[6]Democratic Federation, founded in 1881, changed its name to Social Democratic Federation in 1883.

[7]*Modern Thought* (1879-1884), founded for free discussion of social, political, scientific, &c., subjects.

[8]Bax, Ernest Belfort (1854-1926). Assisted in formation of Social Democratic Federation, edited *Justice* and *To-day*, a leader of the split in the Social Democratic Federation in 1884 which led to the foundation of the Socialist League. After the death of the S.L. returned to the S.D.F., and was a strong supporter of Hyndman.

[9]Sorge, Friedrich Albert (1828-1906). Exiled from Germany in 1848, went to America. Founded the German General Workers' Union there in 1868 ; Secretary of the First International from 1872 onward. Close friend of Marx and Engels.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Your Mr. Garcia is one of the many little democrats who abound here in London and poke their noses into all the organisations. Their latest central leader or, as Stieber[10] used to call it, "head chief," is a barrister named Hyndman, a careerist of strong democratic tendencies and an unsuccessful candidate at the last parliamentary elections. All these little people have no one behind them but one another. They are split into all kinds of sects, as well as non-sectarian ordinary-democratic drivellers. Their main preoccupation is to cut a fine figure in the world. Hence all the enumeration of unknown celebrities in his letters. Goodwill most of them possess in abundance—but also the goodwill to play an important part. I would advise you, therefore, to treat the man's letters *very carefully :* his main object, in the last resort, is to parade as an important party a little clique which for twenty years, under various names and in various disguises, has remained the same nullity. But the *Sozial Demokrat*[11] does not, in my opinion, exist in order to build up a continental reputation for these busy nonentities.—Engels to Bernstein, October 27, 1882.

The manifesto[12] of the London Democratic Federation was issued by some two or three dozen little societies which for at least twenty years under various names (with continually the same members) have again and again, and always with the same lack of success, attempted to get themselves taken seriously. The only importance of the affair is that now they have at last been forced openly to recognise our theory, which during the time of the International seemed to them bestowed upon them from outside, and that of recent years youngsters from the bourgeoisie have made their appearance who, to the shame of the English workers it has to be said, have a better understanding of the situation and display more enthusiasm than the workers. Even in the Democratic Federation the majority of the workers accept the new programme formally and reluctantly. The leader of the Democratic Federation, Hyndman, is an arch-Conservative and is an extremely chauvinistically minded, although by no means stupid, careerist, who behaved shabbily in regard to Marx, and so we broke off personal relationships with him. In no circumstances think of believing anyone who tells you that a genuinely proletarian movement is developing in England. I know that Liebknecht[13] wants to convince himself and the

[10]Stieber, Wilhelm (1818-1882). Prussian police official, specialised in spying on the leaders of the working-class movement, outside as well as inside Prussia.

[11]*Sozial Demokrat* (1879-1890). Central organ of the German Social Democratic Federation, edited by Bernstein.

[12]*Socialism made Plain.* Issued in 1883 immediately after the Federation openly proclaimed itself socialist.

[13]Liebknecht, Wilhelm (1826-1900). One of the founders of the German Social Democratic Movement and close friend of Marx and Engels, especially during his period of exile in London after 1848.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole world that this is so, but that is not the case. The elements displaying activity at the present time may acquire significance, after assimilating our theoretical programme and thus getting a basis—but only when a spontaneous movement among the workers breaks out here and if they succeed in *mastering* that movement. Until then they are individuals behind whose backs are a melange of confused sectarians, remnants of the great movement of the forties, and nothing more. But a real, general workers' movement will arise here—if nothing unforeseen occurs—only when the workers feel that the English world monopoly is broken. Participation in the hegemony of the world market has been and remains the economic basis for the political nullity of the English workers. Dragging at the tail of the capitalists in the matter of the economic exploitation of that monopoly, but still sharing its benefits, the workers naturally in political regards are dragged at the tail of the "great Liberal Party," which for its part throws them some small crumbs, has recognised their right to trade unions and strikes, has given up the struggle for an unlimited work day, and has granted electoral rights to the mass of the higher placed workers. But if America and the united competition of the other industrial countries forces a sufficiently wide breach in that monopoly (in regard to iron that is already happening, but in regard to cotton unfortunately it is not), you are destined to see much.—Engels to A. Bebel,[14] Eastbourne, August 30, 1883.

Has Tussy Marx[15] sent you *To-day*[16] and the last numbers of *Progress*?[17] If not I'll see to it. These organs are *quite outside* the Trades Union movement; indeed, they are carried on by a *very mixed* lot of people. Bax is fine, but still rather green; Aveling[18] good, but too busy to swot up economics—a subject entirely foreign to him; Joynes,[19] an unreliable person (he was a master at the famous Eton School, travelled Ireland with

[14]Bebel, August (1840-1913). Leader of German Social Democracy and of Second International. Was greatly under Marx' and Engels' influence, but after death of latter gradually shifted to the right, and headed the Centrist groups in the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the International.

[15]Marx, Tussy (1856-1898). Eleonora, Marx's youngest daughter, wife of Edward Aveling.

[16]*To-day* (1883-1889). A monthly "Magazine of Bold Thoughts" founded by Ernest Belfort Bax; in 1884 declared itself "the monthly magazine of scientific socialism."

[17]*Progress* (1883-1887). Edited by G. W. Foote, the Secularist, assisted by Edward Aveling.

[18]Aveling, Dr. Edward (1851-1898). Began his public career as a Darwinist and Atheist in association with Bradlaugh. Came under Engels' influence at the beginning of the '80's, played an active part in the S.D.F. and later in the Socialist League, and helped in the unorganised workers' movement in the '80's and '90's.

[19]Joynes, James Leigh. Socialistic poet and translator, known for his *Socialist Catechism* and a poor translation of the first nine chapters of *Capital*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry George,[20] was arrested with him, lost his job—and is consequently looking around for something to do); and Hyndman a *pushful* party-chief *in partibus infidelium*,[21] searching for a party and in the meantime issuing orders in a vacuum—but nevertheless quite a clever fellow. The best thing to do is to acknowledge these efforts without identifying oneself with the persons. In any case the appearance of *To-day* and the transformation of *Progress* into a socialist journal just at this moment, when the misery of the East End of London is beginning to cry aloud, are of great importance. In addition the whole country is stagnant with overproduction, which seems to be pressing matters towards a crisis. The circumstances are favourable; but whether the people who have taken affairs into their hands are equal to them remains to be seen. This time things will hardly, like so many previous beginnings, come altogether to nothing.—Engels to Bernstein, January 1, 1884.

. . . In England also industry has acquired a different character. Seemingly the ten years' cycle has broken down since, beginning with 1870, the American and German competition has begun to destroy England's monopoly on the world market. Since 1868 a tight business situation, together with a slowly growing production, ruled in the main spheres, but now America and England seem to be threatened with a new crisis, which in England has not been preceded by a period of expansion. Therein lies the secret of the sudden (although it has been slowly preparing over the last three years) yet now suddenly emerging socialist movement. The organised workers—the trade unions—have so far held themselves quite apart from it; it is developing under the leadership of "educated" elements come from the bourgeoisie, who in some places, sometimes not without success, are seeking to get into touch with the masses. In the moral and intellectual regard these people are of very varying quality, so some time will pass ere they have sorted themselves out and the situation is cleared. But I doubt whether now the movement will again go to sleep completely. With his nationalisation of the land Henry George will in all probability play the part of a meteor, for in England this point has traditional importance, but also a genuine importance in addition, on account of the gigantic dimensions of large-scale land-ownership. In the last resort in the first industrial country of the world the matter cannot for long be confined to this one point. Moreover, George is a thorough bourgeois, and *his* plan—to cover all State expenditure by land rent—only repeats the plan of the Ricardo school and consequently is thoroughly bourgeois.—Engels to A. Bebel, Eastbourne, January 18, 1884.

[20] George, Henry (1839-1897). Author of *Progress and Poverty* and prophet of the Modern Single Tax Movements.

[21] *In partibus infidelium.* In the realms of the unbelievers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More about *Justice*.[22] This paper has been suddenly hurled on to the scene by Hyndman with insufficient financial preparation and *no* literary preparation whatever. *To-day* could have kept itself going and, after six or twelve months, prepared the way for the appearance of a weekly. But now each will weaken the other. But Hyndman can't wait, and will probably burn his fingers once again. They invited me to co-operate, but I refused on the ground of lack of time. One can help with *To-day* without further ado, but that can't be done with a weekly appearing as a party organ, until you know more about it. The first two numbers show by their complete lack of ideas that the people are already at their wit's ends, and are awaiting reinforcements from new contributors. In short, it is a mistake, and only unforeseen favourable developments can help it to its feet again.—Engels to Bernstein, January 28, 1884.

There were two scandalous incidents in connection with the demonstration of the 16th[23]—that of Hyndman and that of Frohme.

It appears Hyndman, without having directly agreed, had been nominated as speaker by Rackow. Doubting his chances of success, he declared (in *Justice*) that a " worker " ought to speak, and that he would be content with listening. In the same number of *Justice* was an extremely supercilious review of the last issue of *To-day*—almost a declaration of war. Then Hyndman intrigued against the sending of delegates to the Roubaix Congress,[24] on the pretext that its sponsors were a minority, and that we had no business to mix ourselves up with the inner conflicts of the French Party. But on the next Tuesday, at the session of the Committee of the Democratic Federation, he was completely defeated: his safest followers rose against him; he could not declare the real motives of his behaviour; participation in the demonstration and in the Congress was enthusiastically agreed on, but Hyndman, who would *now* have given anything to speak at Highgate, had cut off his own retreat, and Aveling gladly accepted the invitation to speak. That's always the way with these clever little rogues; their own cunning makes fools of them.—Engels to Bernstein, March 24, 1884.

[22] *Justice*. Organ of the S.D.F., founded in 1884 and still, as Engels once remarked, getting " more stupid every day."

[23] Demonstration of the 16th. The first anniversary commemoration meeting of Marx's death, held at Highgate Cemetery.

[24] Congress of the French Workers' Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The World of Labour

BRITAIN

East London "Labour Monthly" Conference on the Future of Revolutionary Policy

ON August 13 last in the Minor Hall of the Canning Town Public Hall there took place a Labour Monthly Conference on the Future of Revolutionary Policy in Great Britain. About 120 were present, Comrade G. Finch, in the unavoidable absence of Comrade T. Blackwell, took the chair.

Comrade **Finch,** in opening the Conference, pointed out that this was one of a series of conferences initiated by the LABOUR MONTHLY, the discussions at which have led to a considerable clarification of revolutionary policy. There is a changed atmosphere in the working-class movement on the need for a revolutionary policy, particularly evidenced by the correspondence between the I.L.P. and C.I. (which was circulated to all present in stencilled form). All speakers should give their experiences in the local working-class movement so that as a result of the discussion further clarification can be achieved.

Comrade **Arnot** opened the discussion. Assuming, he said, in accordance with the title of the discussion that all those present realised that there was only one way out for the working class, namely, through revolutionary struggle, it was necessary to get clear what was the immediate policy in view of this. Not only must that immediate policy be directed against Fascism, war, and the employers' offensive, but against those inside the Labour Movement who introduce capitalist policies and so hinder the working-class advance, that is to say, against the reformists.

The method of this struggle must be the method of a united front struggle of all workers, no matter what their political or other differences may be. This united front recently entered a new stage with the joint campaign of the I.L.P. and Communist Party which began as a fight against Fascism, but which later was broadened to include the fight against the capitalist offensive. The progress of this fight showed that all workers were anxious to join in this fight, but that during all this time the Labour Party and T.U.C. were doing precisely nothing except, for instance, to issue a statement consisting of a long tirade on Democracy and Dictatorship, which not only came out against the united front, but showed indifference and indeed hostility to the working-class struggle.

There was an analogy between the policy led by John Paton at the Derby Conference on behalf of the N.A.C. of the I.L.P. with the previous policy of the I.L.P. in 1920-23, when, after withdrawing from the Labour and Socialist International, it took part in the formation of a Two-and-a Half International. Further, a very similar policy was contained in the reply of the I.L.P., signed by Paton, to the letter of the Communist International outlining how the Derby Conference decision of the I.L.P. to approach the Communist International could be carried out. That is to say, the I.L.P. was officially sending

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letters to the C.I. putting forward a policy which it will be recalled was defeated at the Derby Conference. This has resulted in a very strong movement of opinion inside the I.L.P. against this flouting of the Derby policy. It was noticeable that in Lancashire, South Wales, and on the North-East coast opposition to the united front struggle developed, thus indicating that there was a considerable section in the I.L.P. which was trying not to carry out the Derby Conference decisions.

But with this last week, following on the announcement of the resignation of Paton as Secretary of the I.L.P., a statement of policy has been issued in the *New Leader* which represents a very considerable advance in the policy hitherto put forward while not yet fully a revolutionary statement.

The immediate question is that of developing the united front struggle not only against Fascism and the capitalist offensive, but against the capitalists on every question affecting the working-class movement. Secondly, and this is the key question for members of the I.L.P., is the need for co-operating with the C.P. in its struggle against the reformist poison inside the trade unions, the co-operatives, &c., and so developing the fight against reformism in the widest possible way.

But the I.L.P. is only one section of the united front struggle. There exists the need for building it up in the trade unions, co-operatives, and in every working-class organisation. Recently there has been a real development of this struggle, *e.g.*, with the Firestone strike where the strongest feeling for the united front showed itself since the formation of the National Government. This question of raising the building up of the united front here in East London in every trade union branch, &c., is especially necessary now when the General Council of the T.U.C. is putting forward a policy of working in conjunction with the Federation of British Industries, and on Fascism with a policy not very much opposed to the British Government, but definitely against a working-class united front.

In the building trade, what at present is striking everyone is the expulsion of 13 workers from the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers, who everyone knows are amongst the very best trade unionists the union has ever had, but who were expelled solely for fighting for a militant policy of struggle against attacks on wages and conditions. If in every union branch in East London, and at every other working-class meeting a protest against such a policy of expulsion was raised this would be showing the spirit of the united front.

It is precisely on such questions as strike struggles, &c., that the I.L.P., C.P., and rank-and-file workers can combine to drive forward to forming united front committees, committees of action.

Comrade **McKernon**, who stated he was a member of the I.L.P., considered that internationally a lot of the difficulty arose out of the fact that the C.I. will only recognise one party in each country, and therefore the I.L.P. could not affiliate to it direct. Further, the reason for what is stopping the united front must be found ; no matter how small a job, any such action is more convincing than yards of propaganda. The workers by their own pressure must push aside whatever is hampering the united front.

Comrade **Garrard**, speaking as one of the expelled members of the Woodworkers, described how at a local task work centre they had found through the united front organ that signboards were being made for the Labour Exchange

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that signwriters were being taught by making them write the signs on these boards. A protest was made through his own branch and through the local Signwriters' Union branch with a demand for an inquiry. Further, through the united front, after succeeding in breaking down the opposition of some who were against work at the Labour Exchange as reformist and as not work for Socialism, some fifty members were got signed on and benefit was obtained for them for the first time.

Comrade **Healey** spoke in favour of the need for the workers to combine in one big union. If it is good for the Government to have all the people under one insurance scheme, then it is better for all to be in one union.

Comrade **Kearns**, after referring to the mistakes of the I.L.P., detailed by Comrade Arnot, pointed out that the I.L.P. was not the only militant organisation that had made mistakes. For instance, in 1923, while the C.P. opposed Macdonald at Woolwich they supported him the next year at the Aberdare election. Or again, while Comrade Pollitt declared at Memorial Hall that there was no possible chance of co-operation between the I.L.P. and the C.P., yet at the Conway Hall meeting recently we had the more pleasing spectacle of both Comrades Pollitt and Brockway showing the necessity for complete co-operation. He himself still considered there was a fundamental difference, though the line of demarcation has generally become less and less in the last 18 months, between the I.L.P. and C.P. on the question of Parliamentarism. While fully agreeing to the need for participating in the mass struggle in the factories, &c., he considered the possibilities of the vote had not been exhausted in forcing concessions from the capitalist parties. Why does Pollitt stand for Clay Cross if the C.P. does not believe in the vote? He would be pleased if Pollitt won because if Henderson, as representing the strongest candidate of the third capitalist party, is defeated then it is going to have a tremendous effect on the Labour Party and trade union movement. We must use parliament for winning concessions, and as a platform for propaganda, but parliament needs smashing as part of the capitalist system.

Comrade **Barnes** drew a comparison between the revolutionary feeling in 1920 and that to-day; how it then arose out of the war and the excitement of the recent Russian Revolution, but how to-day it is due to the basic, heavy and unclearable depression and therefore has a firmer basis. The movement to-day was not like a mass of members recruited at a meeting who soon tended to be lost, but much more factory and economic based and so less easily swayed from its course. The resignation of Paton shows that the leaders are recognising that this deeper basis exists and that it is becoming more difficult for them to turn it. The pressure of the membership on the leaders was also shown by the fact that the *New Leader* in announcing recently that it is going to *become* a more militant popular paper, admitted that it was the membership which had indicated it desired a change of this nature.

While he was not a member of the C.P., he saw the urgent need of eliminating the waste of time in co-ordinating the various sections. For example, over a recent struggle against the stiffer Means Test regulations in West Ham it was necessary for the I.L.P. and C.P. fractions to meet together, but they both had to meet separately first before finally meeting in the Trades Council. In view of the fact that the Fascists will have from the first a really unified leadership which can and will act immediately, the urgent necessity of one revolutionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party to carry on the united front work is manifest. While that has been recognised in the talk in the *New Leader* on the ultimate need for such a party, nevertheless no heed is paid to the need for speed as was shown by how quickly the Fascists grew in Germany.

Comrade **Townsend,** of the North Staffordshire Anti-War Committee, spoke of the value such a discussion as this would have at another conference in North Staffs. There had recently been a failure to get a united front there, but it should be possible to go back and get a meeting called of the C.P. and I.L.P., and of all sympathisers in order to be prepared for any necessary activity ; for example, against Mosley, who had announced a recruiting tour there and who was offering a black shirt and a £1 to anybody who will join them. A united front was especially needed in that area because Mosley had been particularly active there during the General Strike and already had an inside knowledge of the local trade union and labour movement. It was therefore absolutely necessary for the C.P. and I.L.P. to settle their differences as rapidly as possible ; and the discussion had shown that only one revolutionary party was capable of meeting the crisis.

Comrade **Hoyle** stressed the need for a single united revolutionary party as a result of the widespread desire on the part of the workers for a revolutionary policy. But in the North we had E. Sandham in the *Northern Voice*, the Lancashire I.L.P. organ, coming out against the united front on the ground that the I.L.P. members are tending to become merged in the C.P., leaving unfulfilled the real work of the I.L.P. This means that at a time when the attacks of the capitalists are fiercer than ever, he and his supporters would have the I.L.P. stand as a kind of buffer to prevent any real action on the part of the members. If there are two parties, the speaker continued, it means inevitably division of forces ; we cannot conceive of two revolutionary leaderships : it must be the aim of all who desire a revolutionary policy to achieve from out of the day-to-day experiences and theoretical discussions one single united Communist Party at the earliest moment.

Comrade **Baldwin,** from the Stratford Branch of the N.U.R., stressed the need for getting down to the actual basis of the united front struggle : we find in the railway unions members of the I.L.P. and C.P. acting together in the conferences without any prior consultation. The great need was to develop the Red Trade Union opposition. Work in the trade union branches and factories was the finest way of building the united front. We need to get a common basis of action by fighting capitalism all along the line : we must fight for the retention of what the workers have, and try to carry forward the struggle and win further concessions from the weakening capitalists.

Comrade **Campbell** stated that it was clear to those present that this was no academic discussion, but one of serious importance to the working class. Fascism is no sign of the capitalists' strength, but of their desperation : they throw aside all their democratic trickery and come out nakedly with a dictatorship of force and terror. The unification of the C.P. and I.L.P. would not be merely one of 15,000 I.L.P.-ers uniting with 6,000 Communists, but it would exert a revolutionary effect on hundreds of thousands of workers in the unions and in the rank and file of the Labour Party. All the historical barriers between the C.P. and I.L.P. have disappeared, and what prevents them coming together is not the old arguments. The latest statement of the I.L.P. in the *New Leader*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contains many steps forward, but also one or two backwards. We have to keep the united front not on a basis that appeals merely to the C.P. and I.L.P., but one that appeals to the widest masses of workers.

It would be a mistake to draw a distinction between the united front and the ideological campaign, particularly against the reformists; unless both are combined we cannot win the masses of workers for revolutionary action. Therefore the basis must include the fight against trade union expulsions, against the bowing down of the Labour Party and T.U.C. to Roosevelt's inflationary policy as if to an evangel and against all forms of Fascism, explaining its demagogy as well as denouncing its horrors. The trade union leaders are trying to swing the workers behind their own governments. All these issues can best be fought by the C.P. and I.L.P. in revolutionary combination inside the trade union branch, the co-operatives, &c.

Yes, mistakes have been made by the C.P., but in the case of the C.P. they were made on the basis of trying to pursue a revolutionary policy, not on the basis of spreading reformism and the strengthening of capitalism. What then is keeping the two parties divided? Even on the question of parliamentarism raised by a previous speaker it is perfectly correct, and we agree with him, when he stated that he did not believe it possible to emancipate the working class through Parliament, but regarded Parliament as a useful auxiliary for developing the struggle outside Parliament.

The differences are not in the historical objections, nor in the last few months' differences, but in a series of new objections not rooted in the rank and file experience of the I.L.P., but in the Trotskyist sewer. It is not true when the N.A.C. letter in reply to the C.I. claims that the latter pursued policies which divided the workers' organisations by treating sections outside its own ranks "as enemies indistinguishable from the Fascists and the most reactionary capitalists." When the German leaders a few days before they were suppressed offered their trade unions to Hitler to co-operate with him in building up the Fascist state, what other name can you call them but social-fascists? We have never described the ordinary I.L.P. or L.P. member as a social-fascist, and when such a tendency arose in Germany four years ago it was absolutely denounced. The C.I. has stated that while the chief enemies of the workers were the capitalists, yet the principal support to the capitalists was reformism. Take the myth that the C.I. sabotaged an international blockade of Hitler. The *New Leader* never mentioned the need for this till June 12, five months after Hitler came to power, and then Brockway only brought it up as an argument against the C.I. in order to try and show it was dominated by the Soviet Union.

Actually the main thing that is keeping us back is the attempt on the part of the I.L.P. to form a grouping mid-way between the C.I. and the Labour and Socialist International. The question is whether the reformists are to beat the Communists and so lead to Fascism, or whether the Communists are to smash the reformists in order to prepare the way for working-class triumph.

The Communist Party suggests a unity conference in which each participates according to its strength in order to create a new mass revolutionary Communist Party on the basis of the C.I. programme, and so lead to this triumph of the working class.

Comrade **Speaight** disagreed with the speaker who thought we were wasting too much time in discussion. Action is necessary, but we must know where it is going to lead. We must be careful in fighting for concessions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not to bring about a revolutionary situation without a revolutionary leadership as in Italy where, before Fascism, they had a weakened capitalism, but no agreement as to what was the correct leadership. In Lancashire the I.L.P. adopted many methods of the C.P. because they were correct. Though realising that I.L.P. members feel loyal to their party, yet when the way of the united front shows you are adopting C.P. forms, then surely it is waste of time to let the opportunity slip by through divided leadership and not form one united revolutionary party.

Comrade **Raylock** pointed out how the young workers are going forward in united action against the capitalists, as shown in the series of strikes for instance, in London at Silver's, Venesta's, and Hillman's. There is a strengthening of the desire for unity. The last conference of the I.L.P. Guild of Youth decided to organise its membership on a factory and street basis, and to conduct propaganda in the armed forces. It instructed the E.C. to approach the Young Communist International (Y.C.I.) with a view to arriving at a working agreement on the revolutionary struggle of the young workers in Britain. The year previous the Guild had disaffiliated from the Young Socialist International. The unamimous decision to approach the Y.C.I. compares favourably with the narrow vote at the I.L.P. Conference. The Young Communist League (Y.C.L.), the Guild of Youth and the co-operative Youth have fixed up a united front not only against Fascism and war, but against the capitalist offensive. So far this united front has been too much one of propaganda and too little one of action. Can the Guild have anything more to do with an international such as the Young Socialist International which prohibits its sections from joining in a united front and expels the American section's secretary for taking part in a conference with the Y.C.L. to demand the release of Tom Mooney and Billings. The Guild cannot remain between heaven and earth like Mohammed's coffin. Let members decide after working side by side with the Y.C.L. workers in the factories and amongst the young employed to come together with the Y.C.L., and on the basis of the programme of the Y.C.I. go forward as one united Young Communist League.

Comrade **Romano** commented on the paucity of serious working-class membership in his Guild of Youth branch. He suggested that a considerable factor in the approach of the I.L.P. to the C.P. was that many of the Guild members were also I.L.P. members; they said to the wiseacres and the greyheads in their I.L.P. branches: "We are going to have some connection with the real working class—that is the C.P.—to get to work on working-class issues." Again, an older member a short while back said we must be careful in our approach to the C.P. on the united front agreement: "We know that these people will take our membership if possible." But now since Paton has resigned and the new I.L.P. statement has been issued, this same member said he had much more confidence in the C.P. than ever before. The speaker considered this was taking place all over the country.

Comrade **Hanson** said it was quite obvious that the conference was in agreement on the need for setting up of one revolutionary party. We must draw the lessons from the past, how in 1931 the leadership betrayed us, while in 1933 the decision to approach the C.I. was not carried out in full. He asked everyone here in the I.L.P. as he was himself, to put forward a resolution in each of their own, and adjacent, branches, for setting up one United Revolutionary Party so that there is a movement for this all over London.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comrade **Ward** said he had listened to the different speakers here to-night and everyone, whether he be I.L.P. or C.P., seems to agree with Marx. You are all Marxists. But Marx had only one way. How do you find two? In any country in the world where the workers are making progress they are not divided. Take that comparatively uncivilised country, Cuba. The people are absolutely starving; but they were not prepared to give in to the machine-gun terror of the last president; they wouldn't give in till they got him out, and they did get him out, but they didn't do it by being divided. He disagreed with a previous speaker on the question of Parliament; for instance, when Saklatvala was in the Commons people read the paper to see what Sak. had to say, but now he isn't there many are now saying we cannot hear anything from the Communists.

The colonial workers are looking to the workers of this country for a lead. There is no division amongst them. They see only the exploiter and the exploited. It is essential that the workers of this country—the head of the British Empire—shall give them a lead.

Comrade **Page Arnot,** in reply, said that what emerged most clearly from the discussion was this: when Comrade Barnes mentioned the need for a united party as urgent and not as an ultimate aim, according to the words of the recent I.L.P. statement, the whole audience obviously agreed with him. This does not mean that the battle is won. It will mean a big struggle to get rid of the Two-and-a-half International policy as put forward against the Derby Conference decisions, and will need as big a fight to clear it out as that which compelled Paton's resignation.

The need for urgency should be the note of the Conference especially in view of the fact that Fascism can develop very speedily here in Britain. There are half-a-dozen forms of Fascism developing, *e.g.*, (1) the Black Shirts, (2) the Social Centres, (3) Trenchardism, (4) Beaverbrook and Rothermere—the most obvious form; for instance, last night the latter's *Evening News* said: If Roosevelt was successful " let us get rid of all this chatter and let us go the same way as the Continent." Nobody must be allowed to say that as the soil of Britain is unlike that of other countries there is no fear of Fascism. Take the Anglo-Indians and other members of the ruling class who have been accustomed to rule despotically without any pretence at democracy in the colonies, and who are absolutely against any method of ruling except the Fascist method. Do not think that it will be difficult for Fascism to grow in Britain.

Unless we unite the ideological struggle with action we may easily have the Two-and-a-half policy, for instance, coming up again. In regard to the war menace, the position is now like the calm before the storm. War can break out anywhere in a week—in the Polish Corridor, in Austria, &c., &c. It is therefore the duty of all those present to go back and immediately discuss the points and get united action as well as build up a united revolutionary party.

[*Several Book Reviews and Publications reviewed have unavoidably had to be held over till next month.*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Do you read regularly

THE EDUCATIONAL WORKER

THE ORGAN OF THE

Educational Workers' League

(LATE TEACHERS' LABOUR LEAGUE)

It is the only publication dealing with the problems of Teachers, Schools and Scholars from a militant working class point of view

Price 2½d. per month, or 2/6 per annum, post free

Out on first of the month

Order now from **The Manager, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1**

THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

Volume 15 August, 1933 Number 8

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month

THE WORLD ECONOMIC CONFERENCE AND WAR
R.P.D.

From Bernstein to Hitler
FRITZ HECKERT

The I.L.P. and the Comintern
BOB EDWARDS

Unity versus the Manœuvres of Citrine & Co.
JOHN A. MAHON

World of Labour Book Reviews

R. PALME DUTT

and most of the other writers in "The Labour Monthly" contribute articles to

THE DAILY WORKER

News of the Class Struggle on every front : Workers' Sport, Films, Book Reviews, &c., &c.

THE WORKERS' ONLY DAILY

1d. per copy or 7d. a week post free. Circulation Dept.
41 TABERNACLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.2

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

En Passant . . .

May we remind you that the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society, equipped with four spacious factories, up-to-the-minute machinery and skilled craftsmen, is always at your service. For a considerable number of years this firm has been the "pantheon" of everything appertaining to the art of Printing, and now, combined with departments for Box-making and Stationery, is capable of undertaking work of every description. No order is too small or too large but that it will receive our utmost attention—and at the right price.

The Sign of Quality

LEICESTER CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING SOCIETY LIMITED

LEICESTER: HEAD OFFICE, CHURCH GATE
BOX FACTORY: SHORT STREET, LEICESTER
LONDON: 58 GOUGH STREET, W.C.1
KETTERING: 24 KING STREET

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Charles St., Leicester.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED